DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 181 779 HE 012 180

AUTHOR Ligon, J. Frank, Ed.
TITLE Closing the Gaps in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Oregon State Univ., Corvallis.
PUB DATE 21 Oct 77
NOTE 107p.; Proceedings of the 39th Annual Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education meeting in conjunction with the Academic Affairs Administrators (Northwest Region) (Oregon State University, October 19-21, 1977)
AVAILABLE FROM Oregon State University Press, 101 Walso Hall, Corvallis, OR 97331 ($3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; Conference Reports; *Consortia; Continuous Learning; Educational Finance; Educational Trends; *Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Development; Financial Needs; Futures (of Society); *Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Needs Assessment; *Regional Cooperation; Regional Programs; Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Proceedings of the 1977 annual Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education meeting in conjunction with the Academic Affairs Administrators of the Northwest Region are presented. Among the conference presentations were the following: an address of instructional development and other academic services by Kenneth Eble and a panel discussion on this topic; a panel discussion on developments and directions concerning a northwest consortium on instructional development; a brief overview on financial prospects and educational program offerings by Ernest Hartung; an address on the experience of Portland Community College by Amo De Bernadis; a panel discussion on educational need areas in higher education; a videotape presentation on the Oregon Lifelong Learning Project by Valerie McIntyre; an address on prospects for the future by William Sullivan; and the business session of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED181779

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Closing the Gaps in Higher Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Oregon State
Univ Press

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 012 140

Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education

Closing the Gaps in Higher Education

Proceedings of the Thirty-Ninth Annual
Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education
meeting in conjunction with
The Academic Affairs Administrators (Northwest Region)
Oregon State University
October 19-21, 1977

Edited by
J. Frank Ligon

Published for the Conference by
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Corvallis, Oregon

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education.
Closing the gaps in higher education.

(Proceedings of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education; 39)
1. Universities and colleges—The West—Congresses. 2. College administrators—The West—Congresses. I. Ligon, John Frank, 1917- II. Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education. III. Academic Affairs Administrators (Northwest Region) IV. Title. V. Series: Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education. Proceedings; 39th, 1977.
L13.P26 39th, 1977 [LB2301] 378'.008s
ISBN 0-87071-277-2 [378.78] 79-19563

© 1979 Oregon State University Press
Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 1
Stuart Knapp, J. Frank Ligon

SPEAKERS AND PANELISTS..... 3

DOES TEACHING REALLY COUNT? SOME IDEAS ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER ACADEMIC SERVICES..... 5
Kenneth Eble

WHAT'S TO DO ABOUT IT? (A Panel Discussion)..... 12
Leon McCarrey, Moderator
Amo De Bernardis, Antone Van Vliet,
Kenneth Eble, David King, Panelists

A NORTHWEST CONSORTIUM ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT? INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS AND REGIONAL DIRECTIONS (A Panel Discussion)..... 28
Bari Lynn Gilliard, Moderator
Nancy Borchgrevink, John Friesen, Larzette Hale,
John Hosely, Stuart Knapp, Barry Noonan, Panelists

IS OUR MONEY WHERE OUR MOUTH IS?..... 51
Ernest Hartung

CLOSING THE GAPS: SOME ANSWERS FROM PCC..... 57
Amo De Bernardis

WHAT STILL NEEDS PLUGGING? (A Panel Discussion)..... 67
Frederick Boyle, Moderator
Bob Adams, Ramon Chacon, Orcilia Forbes,
Valerie McIntyre, Tim Perkins, Panelists

SITE VISITATIONS..... 81
Valerie McIntyre

HOW DO WE DO IT? FROM HERE TO THE 80'S..... 82
Father William Sullivan

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION
The Thirty-Ninth Annual Meeting..... 92
Business Session..... 93
Member Institutions..... 96
Conference Participants..... 99
Proceedings of Previous Meetings..... 102

CLOSING THE GAPS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Introduction

This Joint Conference, the first of its kind for both organizations, is a happy combination of the accidents of time and of converging interests.

It happened that on the very same dates of October 21-22 in 1976 AcAfAd was meeting at Washington State University in Pullman and PNCHE was at Idaho State University in Pocatello. Stuart Knapp and Stefan Bloomfield represented Oregon State University at Pullman. Delmer Goode and Frank Ligon were at the PNCHE meeting in Pocatello. Simultaneously, Stuart Knapp and Frank Ligon were elected chairmen and hosts of their respective associations for their 1977 conferences.

Both AcAfAd and PNCHE are long-standing informal organizations of Northwest educators. PNCHE had its beginnings at the University of Washington in 1936. It is a loose, "nomadic" association of academics from the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia and the northwest states of Alaska, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. Its continuity is provided by an executive secretary-treasurer. Its stated purpose is to discuss common problems, share experience and thinking, and encourage cooperative activities among faculty, students, and academic administrators of the participating institutions.

AcAfAd is an affiliate of the American College Personnel Association. Its purpose is to provide for association and communication among colleagues on student academic problems and to exchange information on student academic affairs, procedures, and policies.

In both groups, colleagues gather to discuss and look for solutions to problems of mutual concern. AcAfAd has been oriented toward the manifold problems of the academic support services. PNCHE has largely devoted itself to the academic issues of teaching and learning.

But at the separate conference meetings in 1976, both organizations were concerned with the many discrepancies between what is and should be in all areas of postsecondary education --administrative and academic. The student services people of AcAfAd expressed an interest in a discussion of the problems of their academic counterparts. The PNCHE conference in turn was interested in the problems of the student support services --basic and remedial instruction, proper placement of students, academic and career counseling and guidance, retention, follow-up of student progress, job placement.

Since Oregon State University was committed to host both conferences at approximately the same time and the two newly elected chairmen work closely together on many problems, the result was this joint conference of the two organizations on the theme of "Closing the Gaps in Higher Education."

The theme is obviously ambiguous and has room within it for the discussion of a host of concerns--basic and remedial education; proper placement; guidance and counseling; retention; true opportunities for minorities; two-year, four-year articulation; improvement of teaching and learning; credit for experimental learning; new clienteles; consumerism; expectations of the public and of legislatures; requirements of employers; student-teacher, teacher-administration, and intersegmental relationships.

During the two conference days, all of these topics, and others, were touched upon by Kenneth Eble, Bari Lynn Gilliard, Ernest Hartung, Amo De Bernardis, and Father William J. Sullivan, who delivered the principal addresses, assisted by an array of able panelists and augmented by free and active participation from the audience.

As in past years, these conference proceedings are published by the Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education. They will be distributed to all registrants at this conference from both organizations and to the presidents and libraries of participating PNCHE institutions.

Oregon State University is honored to have been host institution for this productive joint conference of two distinguished associations of Northwest educators.

Stuart E. Knapp, Chairman
Academic Affairs Administrators

J. Frank Ligon, Chairman
Pacific Northwest Conference on
Higher Education

Speakers and Panelists

Bob Adams, Vice President, Linn-Benton Community College
Bob Albrecht, Vice Provost, University of Oregon
Nancy Borchgrevink, Seattle Central Community College
Frederick H. Boyle, President, Central Oregon Community College
Ramon Chacon, Director, Upward Bound, Oregon State University
Amo DeBernardis, President, Portland Community College
Kenneth E. Eble, Professor of English, University of Utah
Orcilia Forbes, Dean of Students, Portland State University
John Friesen, Educational Foundations, University of Calgary
Bari Lynn Gilliard, Graduate School, Idaho State University
Larzette Hale, Utah State University
Ernest Hartung, Director Idaho Research and Development Foundation and Past President, University of Idaho
John Hosely, Dean of Academic Affairs, Linfield College
David J. King, Dean, College of Liberal Arts, Oregon State University
Stuart E. Knapp, Dean of Undergraduate Studies, Oregon State University
Frank Ligon, Assistant to the President, Oregon State University
Leon R. McCarrey, Deputy Commissioner, State Board of Regents, Utah System of Higher Education; Executive Secretary Treasurer, PNCHE
Valerie McIntyre, Community Service and Public Affairs, University of Oregon
Barry Noonan, Curriculum Coordinator, Portland Community College
Tim Perkins, Director, Communication Skills Center, Oregon State University
Father William J. Sullivan, President, Seattle University
Antone Van Vliet, State Representative, Oregon House of Representatives

DOES TEACHING REALLY COUNT?

Some Ideas on Instructional Development and Other Academic Services

Introductory Remarks: TIM PERKINS, Oregon State University

It is my pleasure to introduce Dr. Kenneth Eble today. I jumped at the opportunity to introduce him because he is responsible for bringing back into print the book which is the center of my master's dissertation, Kate Chopin's The Awakening. I was, of course, interested in finding out from him first of all how he came about finding this book, but more importantly how he came to be writing books about teaching education and evaluation.

Ken's comment was most illuminating and might well set the tenor for this talk today. He said: "I think the real reason was that when I graduated from Columbia University with my doctorate I didn't begin in literature because graduate school was such a distressing experience for me." I thought to myself, well that makes sense, now here is an honest person. The result of his graduate studies at Columbia University, the first result I should say, is a book called The Profane Comedy: American Higher Education in the Sixties, a book that made some splash, although it did not make him rich.

Ken's background is varied, both in literature and in educational writing. In addition to The Profane Comedy he has written a book called A Perfect Education, published in 1966. He has done some work with AAUP. He was the director of the project to improve college teaching, and wrote two pamphlets or short books as a result of that, one of them dealing with professors as teachers, the other dealing with the recognition and evaluation of teaching. He has also written a book on The Ten Year Debate and his most current book is called The Craft of Teaching. In addition to this, he has written critical volumes about the author F. Scott Fitzgerald, and has also done a book William D. Howells: A Century of Criticism.

Professor Eble brings a great deal of experience to this group. He has spoken twice before at PNCHE conferences, once in 1968 in Salt Lake City and in 1971 at Willamette University in Salem. It is my pleasure once again to introduce Dr. Kenneth Eble.

KENNETH E. EBLE, University of Utah

The last time I addressed myself to this topic was in Professors as Teachers, published in 1972 and reporting on the Project to Improve College Teaching which I directed from 1969 to 1971. The last chapter is called "Is Teaching Obsolete," and the general conclusions are that "teaching matters," and that "the seventies offer great opportunities for teachers. The building of graduate institutions and the development of graduate research and scholarship may have reached, for a time, a point of consolidation. Public financing and professional responsibility may now shift to undergraduate teaching." There followed a list of specific possibilities which came out of the Project's concluding conference. These included creation of alternative teaching environments, specific efforts to foster faculty teaching competence continuing attention to flexibility in pedagogy and curriculum, collaborative teaching, experimental learning, and others.

There was probably some wishful thinking in these conclusions, but I remain hopeful that events since 1972 haven't proved them entirely wrong. What I wish to begin with today--1977--are some recent indications that teaching may not count for very much. After that I'll try to tackle that formidable bundle of things listed under the subheading on the program: "Some Ideas on Instructional Development and Other Academic Services."

Item: A couple of weeks ago the Vice Chancellor, Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education, paid me a dubious compliment in response to a talk on teaching I had just given in Oklahoma City. He said that they should really try to keep me in Oklahoma, maybe providing space and exhibiting me at the Zoo. Before you jump to obvious conclusions, his reasoning was that I was either a rare bird or an almost extinct species: a professor who apparently possessed some respectable academic credentials but who still thought teaching was important enough to go around talking about it.

Item: Last week's Chronicle of Higher Education had a classified ad for a President of Mid-American University, a consortium of midwestern universities primarily engaged in "teaching at a distance." The phrase depresses me almost as much as being tagged for the zoo, for I have spent much of my energy in arguing that teaching and learning do not satisfactorily take place "at a distance." For 25 years I have been pecking away at reducing the distances between teachers and students, scholars and teachers, research and teaching, higher education and the public schools, education and the public, undergraduate and graduate education. I do not like to see educational distances more sanctioned than they already are.

Yes, I know what these institutions--Universities of Kansas, Iowa State, Nebraska, Minnesota, Missouri, South Dakota--are getting at, though on the campuses of most of them there are distances that might well be narrowed before striking out in the greater beyond. The language of specialized technological bureaucracy--"The consortium's principal activities include development of multimedia courseware for use by institutions nationwide" --fails to capture the imagination just as "teaching at a distance" is not as magical as those recurrent TV spots through which Bell Telephone assures us that calling home is just as good as being there.

Item: My institution (which I single out only as a typical, large state institution) passed last spring an Academic Renewal regulation, which "allows the student to request that his or her academic record be reviewed for the purposes of discounting, for grade point average computation, all calendar years prior to the time of the request for renewal." For all the timidity and hedging in this regulation, it struck me as highly enlightened. It modified the doctrine, strictly held everywhere almost, that one's academic sins must follow one to the grave. And it didn't flinch at the corrupting influence of business but rather let a business practice overrule theology. Now a GPA impoverished student could declare academic bankruptcy (that is, if he or she were willing to wait ten years for it). Notwithstanding, I regarded this measure as one timid step toward recognizing the diversity of man and womankind and the ups and downs of learning. My distress was the greater, then, to find that when the first opportunity came to extend "academic renewal" to the first petitioner, it ran into

serious opposition from the same faculty committee which had passed the legislation in the first place.

Item: The Bakke case finally having reached the Supreme Court, one can begin to hear (though not as much from within higher education as from outside) that colleges and universities have had discriminatory admissions policies for decades. Russel Baker, the New York Times columnist, abandoned his usual comic stance, to write a serious column about the issue, under the title in my local paper, "Nobody Sues the Fullback." His point was the obvious one: "It makes for little boiling of the blood when an applicant with straight A's in high school is passed over for a promising fullback who will obviously have to settle for the gentleman's C. At least nobody has yet gone to the law claiming he has been discriminated against because a college for which he was academically qualified rejected him in favor of a football player with lower grades." My unvoiced response is "Why not?" Why has there not been more concern with the colleges and universities for this kind of discrimination, and why should the Bakke case not stir up some normally silent professors to worry about erosion of standards as a consequence of admitting minorities?

I do not argue that these signs of--how shall I put it--hostility toward, neglect of, misunderstandings of, confusion about teaching and learning prove that teaching doesn't really count. Nor do I intend to use them to launch a discussion of current problems and concerns. They are, if anything, vague symptoms of chronic ills: college and university professors who have systems and hardware and technology, faculty and students with excessive concern for grades and certifying, and both academic and public confusion about education's relation to social needs.

If they say anything to me that can be quickly summarized, it is that teaching only counts for so much within American colleges and institutions, and that it would count even less if the views of any one academic constituency--students, faculty, administrators, trustees, or alumni--were to prevail. Despite repeated setbacks in doing so, we need to educate one another.

Let me see if I can give specification to this general plea at the same time as I address the other parts of the announced topic:

"Some Ideas on Instructional Development and Other Academic Services." Defining the problems: Who the student is (whom we are serving), where he is, what he needs. Implications for students, student services, administration, instruction, research, public service, lifelong learning, professional development.

A tall order. But since it does say "Some Ideas," maybe I can set forth a few.

First, instructional development. I am suspicious of the word "instructional." I suspect it was chosen to avoid saying "faculty" development and thus making some faculty members uncomfortable over the possibility they might need developing. But we should not let such tender feelings keep us from plain speaking. Faculty development is a respected and visible movement, though a dean recently said to me that he thought the movement had peaked, probably meaning, "thank God, we don't have to deal with that anymore." "Instructional Development" is a respectable term, too, though it shifts the focus, and often usefully, away from teacher to courses, curriculum, delivery systems, and the like. Many of the interesting teaching ideas being supported here at Oregon State through Stuart Knapp's office properly fall under instructional development, though obviously they assist the faculty member's development at the same time.

Second, other academic services. I am sure that it is inadvertent that this seemed to regard "Instructional Development" as just another academic service. As teaching and learning should be the central purposes of a university, faculty and instructional development should be central functions and not just lumped with other academic services.

Third, who the student is. I don't know in the abstract, and neither do, I think, my colleagues or the public who are currently so ready to identify students as being unable to read, write, figure and the like. I know every day at 8:50 and 11:00 and most days 1:00 to 3:00, because they are there with me. And I would honestly have to say of my students this fall that they seem to read better and write better than students in any comparable classes I can remember.

There is one other observation I would like to make, not about students directly, but about faculty perception of students. According to the Ladd and Lipset 1977 faculty survey, 71 percent of all professors think "too many people ill-suited to academic life are now enrolling in colleges and universities." Worse still, is that an even higher percentage of faculty express this belief at those institutions--"junior colleges and lesser four-year institutions"--most designed to expand educational opportunity.

Fourth, whom are we serving, where he is, what he needs? This covers too much territory to respond to briefly. The faculty response just alluded to doesn't indicate a very enlightened conception of student needs and faculty serving. The masculine pronoun also needs changing, for we are steadily serving more "she's" in higher education just as we are serving and will continue to serve more older people, more students returning to interrupted college careers, more parttime students--in short, a wider variety of students than ever before.

Fifth, implications for students, student services. I recently read that the President of the University of Oregon had decided not to replace a Dean of Students, but to put the money into faculty positions. I do not know all the facts behind that decision so I can't pass judgment upon the wisdom of it, but I think it is a good sign of recognition of change. Social change, changes in the size and makeup of students, changes in customs, in family patterns, in faculty dispositions, have surely eroded the position that Deans of Men and Deans of Women used to occupy. I'm not saying all these changes are for the good, nor am I going to spell out who within the university community should render what services to students and how. I have some desire to see the separation bridged that often exists between faculty and academic departments and student services. I would like to see more faculty render student services just as I would like to see more faculty render student service personnel brought more fully into academic programs.

Sixth, administration, instruction, research, public service, lifelong learning, professional development. I am weary of tackling any of these blockbusting topics even in a notational way. I suspect they might be better taken up in the give and take of

the panel and with you in the audience. So let me conclude with some observations that are more soundly grounded in my experience with teaching, trying to improve teaching, and faculty development over the past ten years.

I think teaching and learning will continue to suffer in most institutions from the divided, if not fragmented attention of the faculty. I think large institutions obviously serving multiple purposes will have to give up on demanding a single standard of performance for faculty. We know large numbers of faculty members within any institution do not publish, do not operate very often at the frontiers of knowledge, and do not aspire to hold chair positions in major graduate schools. Almost as certainly, we know that within this large group are excellent people serving students, the public, and the institution in the variety of ways a modern university demands. Still, the accommodation has been slow in coming which would adequately recognize this variety of talents, that teaching is complex and demanding and important enough to get the major share of some professors' imagination and intellect. Surely professional pressures should not be such as to cause some professors to wish they could be free to teach. Surely it is not healthy for an executive on a higher education board or a legislator or a parent paying tuition to hold the opinion that professors don't care about teaching.

I also think that in most large institutions, administrative structures, attitudes about governance, and the faculty's and administration's responsibilities for governance are in a state of considerable confusion. When I first came into the profession, one could be fairly certain that an adversary relation existed between faculty and administrations. At best, this took the form of strong faculty senates effecting a balance of power with equally strong administrations. Perhaps the turmoil of the Sixties swept away all patterns. But what I see now seems to suggest that no one is in charge of academic matters, both sides (if that's the way it falls out) preoccupied with largely nonacademic issues over the bargaining table or all sides finding it convenient to assume someone else is doing whatever may need to be done.

Finally, since there seems to be a drift to conservative stances these days, I will join forces with them and ask for a back-to-the-basics movement in higher education. I don't mean

back to a rigid curriculum and higher standards and rigorous grading and reviving Prom Queens and Pompadours. I am talking about as simple and basic and complex and farreaching questions as "What are we in higher education trying to do?" Only by reviving that debate are any of us likely to resist becoming mere victims of a reactionary swing almost as powerful as the radical movements of the Sixties. And since this conference has given me the opportunity to address some substantial part of the diversity within higher education. There are, I assume, faculty members and students and student personnel officers and deans and vice presidents and members of governing boards and maybe even a plain citizen here. I will end by repeating what I said at the beginning. Higher education is no longer a small and separate segment of American life serving 4 percent of the population as students as it did in 1900. It reaches out into the lives of almost everyone, and for that reason alone, an informed discussion of aims of education must be a public discussion. It is proper that higher educational institutions inaugurate such discussions, act as hosts even. But like good hosts, not monopolize the conversation nor be stingy with refreshments. For, yes I say, teaching counts if it is a means of educating one another.

WHAT'S TO DO ABOUT IT?

A Panel Discussion

Introductory remarks: LEON R. MCCARREY, Utah State Board of Regents, moderator

In our efforts to improve teaching in higher education, all too often the focus has been on the so-called "well-lit" areas, on those aspects of teaching that are most comfortable and easy to deal with. I would urge during our panel discussion today that we attempt to probe inwardly: asking the tough, searching questions.

In higher education there are in vogue many novel and varied approaches to the improvement of the quality of instruction. These efforts most often focus on: faculty improvement, methodology, and intra-institutional reorganizational changes. From my experience, the most common approach has been the latter; i.e., to attempt to create a more conducive environment for teaching and

learning through some form of departmental or school reorganization. Closely associated with organizational change is the restructuring of courses and using new instructional media and materials. The area most often neglected--least attended to--is that of assisting faculty members in various ways in the further development and evaluation of teaching skills.

I have long been committed to the proposition that we can tamper all we want to with the structure and the methodology of teaching, but the results will be less than rewarding and very shortlived if we do not pay more attention to the individual faculty member and the structuring of curricula involved in the learning process. The college professor has been characterized as one who thinks otherwise; prizing academic freedom; is eligible for indefinite tenure; regards the classroom as his or her castle; is a specialist among specialists; is more committed to his or her subject or discipline, particularly at the university level, than committed to the institution providing employment. Most faculty members therefore tend to judge institutional matters in terms of their possible impact upon the status or health of their particular discipline.

There are, of course, innumerable ways to measure and improve teaching; particularly when the focus is on short-term objectives. The long-range educational goal of an institution or department cannot be achieved, however, without careful and studied consideration of the psychological aspects of faculty development. Why? Because teaching and learning are people activities, relating to human needs, motivations, and human dynamics. We know, for example, that faculty image is a major consideration in providing quality instruction. Therefore, those of us who labor in the vineyard, providing the higher learning, need to know how to perceive ourselves accurately, how to perceive how others perceive us. We need to understand how criticism affects our motivation as well as praise and reward. And, we must be sensitive; learning to properly interpret the various forms of communication and feedback. Personal insight into how our own fears and expectations affect us will assist us in whatever role we function in.

We must continue to search for the "holy grail;" asking why certain faculty members remain very strong and vibrant through-

out their careers while others stagnate and sputter from the first day in the classroom. I sincerely believe that one of the major factors is the long fostered notion which has discouraged if not forbidden the ongoing evaluation of the professor's classroom activities. If there is no systematic and careful assessment of a faculty member's performance, there will certainly be no strong feeling of accomplishment. From a psychological standpoint, no feedback at all is frequently more devastating than negative feedback. I am not here to prescribe to you the evaluation procedure or process that you should use at your institution, but I do strongly recommend that some type of regular faculty evaluation take place on every campus in the interest of maintaining and improving the quality of instruction.

In summary, teaching without assessment leads to "sickly repetition of an annual recital." You and I often refer to this as the yellow note syndrome that comes when faculty members have reasonable belief that they will be teaching the same courses year after year.

It is now my pleasure to introduce you to the members of the panel: Amo De Bernardis, President of Portland Community College; Ton Van Vliet, Associate Professor of Forest Products at Oregon State University and a member of the Oregon Legislature; David J. King, Dean of Liberal Arts at Oregon State University; and Ken Eble, University of Utah, who has just spoken.

AMO DE BERNARDIS, Portland Community College, Panelist

Mr. Chairman, it is quite an order to condense in three to five minutes what I would like to say on this topic whether or not teaching really counts. The best I can do is to lightly touch the topic. I hope my colleagues on the panel will fill in the blanks.

Teaching will really count in our colleges when each person honestly believes that teaching is important and is honored by the institution. If we are to move teaching to center stage, then we must turn the institution's spotlight on this area. Let us consider a few items which I believe will help move teaching to center stage:

Rewards. Whether we like it or not, adequate reward (salaries) is a way of saying that we honor teaching. Effective and good teaching should see the same recognition in salaries and promotion as research and publications do. Until this happens, teaching will always be playing a secondary role. I realize that money isn't everything, but in our society it still is top priority. So let's put our money where our mouth is and put teaching on an equal priority.

Administrative blessing and encouragement. In the areas of research, the institution supports new thrusts and does not always expect 100 percent success. Some failure in the research process is recognized. However, when it comes to instruction we expect all approaches to be highly successful. I believe that teaching and learning need some encouragement and adequate rewards to venture out into new fields. Only by administrative support and blessing can we expect the faculty to venture out into new areas, to explore new and varied approaches to teaching and learning. They should always know that the administration is there to support them with money and with encouragement.

Staff support services. We need to give to the instructor the same kind of support we give research. If we are to expect faculty members to explore new ways of improving teaching and learning, there must be adequate support services. Far too often we expect the faculty member on his own to develop the media, the approach, the materials, etc. Media, instructional, evalua-

tion specialists, audiovisual technicians, and funds must be available to assist the instructor in his effort to improve teaching. Unless we do this, we cannot expect instructors to give much credence to the idea that the institution believes teaching is important.

Development funds. As mentioned previously, money is an important item. We cannot expect the instructor to make significant thrusts in the matter of teaching and take the thrust out of his hide. If the institution really honors teaching and wants to encourage instructors to venture out into new fields, we must make funds available so that the instructor knows that he will be supported in his effort.

No one best way. I am sure that many of our instructors feel that when specialists in teaching and learning expound their theories they often interpret the message as though there is one best way. I am sure all of us recognize that there are many roads to success in the teaching-learning process. What works for one person will not work for another. We must encourage each faculty member to find a teaching method which fits his personality and style. Our interests should be the results of what happens to the learner, the student. Are the course objectives being achieved? Have they expanded their knowledge base? Are they achieving the objectives set forth by the instructor and the institution?

Closing the gap. We must all work towards closing the gap which exists between the administration and the faculty. Isn't it interesting to note that one day a person can be in the classroom, then the next day he is appointed an administrator and something changes. A gap immediately develops between him and the faculty. What we need is a total effort to recognize that administration and the faculty need to work together to build the best environment for teaching and learning. I do not want to imply that there should not be differences of opinion. The last thing I would ask for is consensus. But we do need to recognize that if the teaching and learning climate is to be conducive to developing new approaches to learning and to developing dignity and honor in the teaching process, then all of us must work together to foster this climate. If we really believe that teaching is the important element in our institution, we must

focus on who is playing the lead role. The instructor is the dey person. It is he who does the teaching. It is he who makes the curriculum come to life. When the instructor closes the door to the classroom or laboratory what happens there is under his control. All of the rest of us are there to support him. We need to develop dialogue but not polarization, not stalemate. The sooner we recognize this fact the sooner teaching will receive more adequate support and the student a better educational program.

The thought I would like to leave is that if we really want teaching to be important in our institution, then all of us must give it the same support, the same reward, the same emphasis we give our research programs, our athletic programs, and so forth. Until we do, the faculty will still think we are giving them only cursory support. It reminds me of the notice I saw posted on the hot air hand-drier in the washroom. "Push here for a brief message from your president." I hope we give the topic more support than hot air.

ANTONE C VAN VLIET, Oregon State University, Panelist

Of course what De (Dr. DeBernardis) did not say is that he is also very effective at the Legislature; Portland Community College certainly reflects that attribute. Although Leon identified me as a politician, I'd much prefer to be among you in my role of a teacher. I look at my role at the Oregon Legislature primarily as a teacher trying to educate other people who are representatives of groups around the state to what our positions are here at the University campus.

I could find very little to argue with in Ken Eble's comments this morning, but I would simply like to share with you preceptions of what people are thinking about at the Legislature. Improvement of teaching funds were completely eliminated from the Oregon higher education budget this year. We have no separate foundation comparable to NSF for the improvement of teaching, although we have some scattered benevolent foundations around the United States that do allow us to get some funds. Improvement of teaching is the first thing to go in reducing a higher education budget because it is very hard to quantify what you

have done with those dollars. It is much easier to say you went out and bought a piece of equipment, a recorder, a special laboratory balance.

Those are the kinds of funds that will be allocated by legislatures because they can put their finger across a line-by-line item budget which is the new fright that is going to be leveled on higher education in the State of Oregon. For those reasons it is extremely difficult to get legislators to be enthusiastic about money for improvement of teaching.

What have we really done in the improvement of teaching? Let me give you my reflections as a teacher. In the last 22 years of teaching on the Oregon State campus, I have seen a lot of people try, with very limited funds, to do a lot of creative things. Like all things, if the desire and motivation is there, we can accomplish some important things with very little; much in the same way that researchers used to get things done before great bundles of dollars were allocated to them. But we do need some of those funds in the improvement of teaching today.

Does teaching really count with students? Yes, it counts very much with students, both the quality of teaching and the improvement of teaching. The students this year very accurately diagnosed the disease, but they articulated the cure very poorly at the legislative level. That does not mean they are not interested and that they are not going to keep trying, because they are. They are going to keep coming back to the Legislature because that seems to be their last court of recourse for the improvement of teaching on the university campus.

Since students have found that there is a gap in teaching quality on the university campus today, where does the responsibility really lie? Can we say it really is in the area of administration? Yes, to a certain extent, although one must be sympathetic with administrators' problems. Developing systems of accurate teaching assessment or evaluation still has not been achieved. We have gone from a self-evaluation system of the Fifties to one where now there is a demand that evaluations be published, and they are being used, basically, as a managerial tool for promotion, tenure, and salary increases. Faculty members know that, students know that. I think not. That is

probably why the gap is growing larger between the assessment of good research versus the assessment of good teaching.

We really have quite a job to do in order to make people conscious at the legislative level of what actually is being done. Legislators today are not shoving higher education aside by desire; they are shoving it aside because other social needs seem greater to them. Other priorities are being substituted for higher education in general, although higher education retains a very esteemed position in the state and most legislators would jump up and down insisting that adequate funds are being given and have been given for a number of years. But they have made no attempt to get at the heart of higher education's problems and probably will still turn their backs on them unless given a very good case for why they should put funds into the improvement of teaching. I hope that these comments will give you some occasion to ask further questions.

DAVID KING, Oregon State University, panelist

I am going to take a somewhat different tack. Everybody has been agreeing with everybody else. I choose to disagree with one or two of Ken Eble's points and also with Tony Van Vliet.

I disagree with Ken about the interest that the faculty has in terms of teaching. In my opinion a great deal of mythology is involved in the issue of the importance on instruction. We've all sat around the commons room; we've all sat in our departments and bemoaned the terrible quality of our students: Why can't we do our research work? Why is it so important to get that extra position? I think a large part of this is myth. When we talk to our really close friends, when we get people aside and talk to them very intimately, somehow teaching comes up as an extremely important function. I think this feeling exists in all of our institutions now. Much of the talk about the lack of importance of teaching, I think, is part mythology that we all tend to reinforce.

I am here today not in an administrative role; for the last two years I have been working half-time for the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. I would like to tell you just

very briefly what I have been involved in for that time.

FIPSE has a project called National Project Three, dedicated to elevating the importance of instruction. Ten institutions, eleven individuals were selected to work half-time on that project. I am required to say at this point that my remarks do not represent the official comments of National Project Three or the Fund. This is not just a pro forma statement. We have been fighting so much with one another over the last two years that just out of self-protection we have all agreed to make that statement. Whatever I say you won't attribute to my colleagues.

Our half-time purchased by the Fund was split up in two ways. A quarter of the time was devoted to our home institution and some work that we were doing locally. Mine happened to be in faculty and administrative evaluation primarily. The other one-quarter of our time and this is where the fight came in, was in trying to write a series of white papers, if you will, which came out under the title of "Criteria," on topics related to National Project Three's theme of elevating the importance of instruction. Copies of the papers are available in the lobby outside the auditorium.

There is one paper on the general scope of the project, one on student evaluation of teaching, one on institutional support for teachers, one on professional development of faculty, one on teachers and new arrangements for learning, one on collective bargaining in higher education, one that we can't seem to get quite written on faculty governance, and lastly one that we are working on now on recommendations.

This last is the one that prompts me to disagree just a bit with Tony. I think we do know enough about instruction to elevate the importance of teaching or of instruction, however, you wish to call it. In our final report we will come up with three sets of recommendations. One set has to do with recognition or reward for teachers, and there are four of these recommendations that we are tussling about. The second set has to do with the evaluation of teachers. I think we really do know how to evaluate teaching, not the the gnat's eyebrow, but enough to do the job. Thirdly, we will have some seven recommendations on institutional support for teachers. I cannot, at this point, go through

all of these recommendations and it would be a mistake if I should, but perhaps some of these recommendations can come out in our comments.

My main point is that teaching is important, that at the base most faculty think teaching is important and enjoy it. We know how to make instruction important if we want to do it. We talk a lot about it, but yet a lot of administrators, a lot of presidents, deans, and chairs do not do what needs to be done to make teaching important. But we can do it. We know how to do it if we want to.

MCCABE:

I would like to begin our discussion by referring to one of the comments made by Dr. Eble. Ken, in his paper, talks in a very general way about the role of the institution in improving the quality of instruction.

President De Bernardis, Mayhew says that the administrator is at the focal point of change and that his role is to make the faculty uneasy and almost to force change. How do you see the change mechanism working within the institution, particularly a community college?

DE BERNARDIS:

We make the faculty uneasy; but that does not make change, that just creates problems. The way that we try to do it is to give dignity to the act of teaching, regardless of the level or subject. For instance, in our institution everybody starts at a given place in the teaching heirarchy, and they can go to the top for their teaching excellence. There is no other requirement for promotion. The degree is secondary to the competence. If you teach English, you have to have a degree in English, but if you teach welding and have a grade school diploma, that is good enough if you can weld.

We give equal money for performance. We put in about a hundred thousand dollars a year for faculty support. If you have got an idea, the money is there for you to do it. I give all kinds of support if somebody wants to do something, but by the same token I do not disturb those people who want to sleep or be quiet, because that is a small group. I agree with you that there are a lot of people who want to do things and there are some that don't, but if you monkey with the ones that don't, you are just wasting your time. Let them sit and eventually they will catch on. I find that 85 percent of the people want to move and they have moved. You don't force them to move. You can talk to them, but that does not do any good by itself. You've got to put the money there too, and you have to give them the same dignity we talk about giving to the students. But, in addition, the chief administrator and every administrator has to believe that teaching is important. If they don't, like any other group, they won't do much about it.

I want to raise one more question. Why is it that in our institutions we teach our students how to be critical about the legislature, how to be critical about the administration in Washington, the administration in the college, about everybody, but we do not want them to be critical about the teaching. That's where you can stimulate something.

McCARREY:

Let me now address a question to Dr. King, as the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at Oregon State University. David, there are colleagues in our respective faculties who feel that the dean is kind of a nice individual to have around, but one of the weaknesses in our present structure is that the faculty really has too little direct interaction, confrontation if you please, with the dean. First, do you agree with this postulate? Second, do you feel that the institution would be more vibrant if there was more interaction between the dean and the faculty? Erskine says that a college dean is like a small boy walking on a high picket fence, thrilled but in constant danger of being impaled.

KING:

That may be, but I don't feel that way. What I would prefer to see in terms of the activity of the faculty is talking less about how they should have a significant input, how they should have an influence on decisions, and taking far more active responsibility for the decisions themselves. I am brand new as a dean at Oregon State University, so it is a bit early to make the judgment you ask for. But I was part of a dean for awhile at my last institution, and it seemed at that institution that there was always the talk about the importance of faculty taking responsibility and doing something, but when they were given the authority and responsibility they seemed to back away from it. I would have to answer that way from my previous experience, but I would not want to make that judgment here.

Let me say that I was disagreeing with two points. One was what I thought Ken Eble was saying about the relative importance of instruction, and the second was what Tony Van Vliet was saying about the evaluation of instruction.

There have been surveys about the relative importance of and interest in our various activities of research, scholarship, service, and teaching, however, these are categorized in our institutions. When these are done anonymously the importance of teaching comes up amazingly high in comparison to what I feel is the mythology that teaching just isn't important but that faculty think it is important. Now I don't know if Ken disagrees with that or not. I thought I caught the implication that he did.

EBLE:

Whether I do or not, I will for purposes of debate. Of course, the faculty care about teaching. It is what they do. The question on the edge of my remarks, made here on the table, is how that concern translates itself into some kind of effective activity that offsets the kind of myth you are talking about.

I know that there are not many people like me. I am talking about the fact that a large part of my energy does go into promoting the importance of teaching, within my own institution and

teaching.

KING:

I agree that we do know some of the qualities that go into good teaching, and I think some of those are measurable. What we do see happening is inconsistency in the reward criteria being used throughout the entire university community. There is a difference between one school's promotion procedures and another school's promotion procedures.

A second obstacle to improvement of teaching is that we may do some very creative things, such as sending some of our faculties out to learn about new teaching techniques, such as individualized instruction. They come back very much like the newly washed coming back from sensitivity training, eager to put this into effect, wanting to make some sweeping changes, only to find themselves stepping back into the same organizational structure. We say, "nice, glad you went," but some extra time to put these new ideas into effect is very tough to get.

What we really need when we send faculty out to learn about new approaches and procedures is to allow them adequate time to come back and really redesign the courso--which may take six months to a year to do a good job.

We do not have that kind of organizational slack in higher education today; legislators have stepped in and are now dictating the tune on how dollars are spent. We have eliminated much of the managerial flexibility, and when we do provide it, we do not have really enough people around courageous enough to take advantage of it. Some way we have got to get some organizational slack that allows us to experiment and make sure that people who are trying to make improvements in teaching have really got the freedom to go ahead and pull it off, and not just stop dead in the water.

McCARREY:

For the next few minutes let's shift gears to another topic.

I think Ken indicated that he was wary of tackling the question of lifelong learning and professional development. I sincerely question if the community of scholars has seriously addressed the issue of lifelong learning; an area of extreme importance. We are finding a good deal of dissatisfaction about the traditional approach to postsecondary education. The approach whereby the prepondance of all resources go to the 18 to 22 year old student. Let me ask Ken, and anyone else on the panel who wishes to respond, this question: Do you think there should be a dramatic change in the focus of education during the next decade, and if so, should the trend be toward providing more lifelong learning options for students of all ages?

EBLE:

Dramatic change? I am looking for some wise changes, some wise moving along in the direction that we'll probably go anyway. There will be more specific efforts directed toward lifelong learning, adult education, and new constituencies. I don't think there is any question about moving in those directions, but I don't think it's going to be dramatic. I think we are going to have an infusion of older students and new clienteles--housewives, people from business, professions, and the trades. All I would ask for is wise recognition and effective acceptance. I welcome this trend toward extending lifelong learning and the new students it brings. I think it makes teaching vastly more interesting to have that wider group of people that you are learning with.

There won't be a dramatic change within the institution, but there is going to be a dramatic change in education. Let me just give you one piece of information which will come out in the Chronicle in the near future. The military states that by 1984, that is tomorrow, one in three high school graduates will be going into the military, men and women. And today, this is dramatic change, the armed forces are planning for the largest degree-granting institution in the world. Already the Community College of the Air Force is one of the largest community colleges in the country. They are now asking for some partnerships, which scare me in a way. That is going to be one dramatic change.

Our city mayor has as much money for education as our University does. Now that may not be a dramatic change, but he could take

elsewhere. I do not feel that I am alone, but I have never felt that I represent a majority of a faculty. All right, I don't have to; I can be comfortable representing a third. However, I am certainly not trying to establish a premise that the faculty in modern institutions do not care about teaching. What I am trying to say is that the perceptions of students, and I think the perceptions of legislators and people like members of executive boards, are that the faculty do not care about teaching. And, I think that is dangerous for us all.

De BERNARDIS:

I would like to respond quickly to what has been said. My point about the large institutions is that regardless of what the faculty and the administration profess about the improvement of teaching, a gap exists between them. One idea that I have been toying with lately as a possible cure is to move toward recognizing different forms of excellence. You do not get that now. In universities you get people who need to devote most of their efforts to undergraduate teaching and who excel at it. They should in a sense be free. I don't think the ordinary reward system lets them. The dean says, sure we reward them; the faculty themselves say, sure we do; the president says, sure we do; but when it comes down to it, we get statistics like you are talking about.

We seem to think that if a university faculty publishes a lot, then it just has to be a great institution. Yet, it may be the lousiest when it comes to teaching, which is what the student is there for. But, what disturbs me most is that among the faculty there is a fear or improvement, of difference, of change, of innovation. They are afraid of moving up in their teaching.

If a teacher is doing something that is turning kids on and what he is doing makes noise and it gets kids off, out of the room, he is doing things that are "nontraditional," he is just goofing around so to speak. Then the faculty says, "We don't do that in our department; that isn't up to our standards." Then they pull him back, especially if he is young or not on tenure, and they chop him into little pieces. That is overstating, but that is one of the reasons we do not get very far with real improvement of

twenty thousand people, and that's another kind of system. Developments like these are going to have a dramatic impact on every institution that exists within this kind of environment, and on the kinds of students we are going to get. It may be that we'll have just those "real great" and elitist students in the university and the community college, whether we want it that way or not.

VAN VLIET:

If you sit on a revenue committee of the legislature, you begin to realize that they do not have a lot of sensitivity about how they are going to distribute funds in higher education or at the community college level. What they are going to do is to pit the two-year against the four-year institution, and they are going to let the survivor get the funds.

Unfortunately, there is probably no great deal of intellectual study of why they do what they do. It is probably just plain raw politics in dollars and the distribution of funds. It is the body-count syndrome, which is the worst thing that ever happened to higher education or education in general. What educators really have to do is make sure that our programs really are good programs meeting a need. We are going to have to throw out some programs, which we often refuse to do.

I would not be for indoctrination, but we are supposed to make our students think, analyze, put it all together, synthesize, and become effective people. And yet when they go to the Legislature, those legislators went to our schools, they do not believe in the system they went through. I do not want to indoctrinate, but really we do not get our students involved in their own education and in supporting us after graduation.

What educators really have to do is make sure that our programs are good programs, meeting a need. We are going to have to through out some programs, which we often refuse to do.

A NORTHWEST CONSORTIUM ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT? INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS AND REGIONAL DIRECTIONS

A Panel Discussion

Introductory remarks: BARI LYNN GILLIARD, Idaho State University, moderator

I am the director of Instructional Development at Idaho State University. It is a small, fledgling program, and because of that I have been interested for a long time in cooperative arrangements with other schools because we cannot field everything we need ourselves on our current small amount of money, and the small staff time available for this sort of thing. I have had in the back of my mind an idea about cooperative arrangements in consortia for some time. Today the panel and I are going to address the idea of a regional consortium on instructional development. We are going to talk about institutional developments, some regional directions, the desirability of such a consortium, what kinds of things a consortium might do, and services it could provide to us that we cannot individually do by ourselves in our own institutions.

As Ken Ebie declared this morning, teaching is a central purpose of our institution. It is our main academic endeavor in all of our institutions. We may have different goals and missions as regional institutions but certainly teaching is a central one in all of them. One of our purposes this afternoon is to catalyze your thinking about instructional development with a view towards making our institutions more effective in this central mission of teaching.

The other purpose is to discuss an instructional development consortium as one way of closing the gaps facing higher education: a way of minimizing the distance between faculty members on our cross-regional campuses; a way of minimizing our geographical limitations in that many of us are in single-college communities and there is not another school close by for us to work with; a way also of closing the gap in financial accountability. It may be more cost effective for us to work together on certain instructional development programs which are very costly, and thus avoid reinventing the wheeel on each individual

campus every time.

To focus on these two purposes, the idea of generating some thinking about instructional development programs and ways they can be shared, we will use this panel in several ways. First, the panelists will serve as their own informants. We have here a variety of experts in various institutional positions who have some experience or exposure to instructional development programs in several ways. We will also serve as reactors to each other's statements, and we will hope to be able to generate questions from you and to be able to answer them, or even be able to ask you some questions as we go through our process.

We will also expand our panel later on by inviting into the discussion some of the people from the audience who are from member schools in a small consortium of private liberal arts colleges, but they are small schools which have already banded together to do some work on instructional development as of this summer and have some things to report to us about their particular progress.

A modern-day philosopher has observed that professional college teaching is simultaneously the most exciting potential for personal development for the professionals involved in it and, at the same time, the one career that can approach near zero with great rapidity. Too many people are at the zero level of the profession. Instructional development is one approach, simply one, which might mitigate the zero effect, which might make faculty more productive. There are other approaches, certainly to faculty excellence, but our subject is to generate good, effective teaching among the faculty through instructional development programs. At the outset each panelist will talk about instructional development from the perspective of his or her position in the institution.

NANCY BORCHGREVINK, Seattle Central Community College, panelist

I think there would be few chief academic officers who would not agree that a college or university ought to be a place for its faculty as well as for its students. It seems to be that we have

particular attention on instructional development these days because we have static enrollments, steady state budgeting, and so forth. Coupled with that we do not have the expanding highly mobile faculty that we had back in the Sixties. We also have tenure and the Federal legislation indicates that mandatory retirement may be moved to age 70, although the Senate version of that, I understand, eliminates tenured faculty from the provision. At any rate, we are retaining and holding pretty much the same kind of faculty over the years.

The problem is particularly acute in the community colleges because community colleges are supposed to be very flexible, innovative kinds of institutions, very responsive to the needs of their local communities and the job markets for whom they train students. In many cases we would probably like to retain some of our tenured faculty to move them as student interests move. Many of us are overstaffed in social sciences and the humanities and have a need for faculty training elsewhere. This makes some very critical problems for us. I think all of us would agree that we are interested in faculty renewal and stimulation.

In fact, during the 1974-75 year the community colleges in the state of Washington had a joint task force composed of representatives of the deans of students and the deans of instruction from all 27 of the community colleges which addressed the problem of development. They looked at what the current state of the art was there and compiled some detailed statistics about what was going on in these several colleges. They also developed a goals statement and nine objectives for what a good staff development should be like. I won't take time to tell you of those, but it was a good initial effort in the State of Washington in terms of what we are doing in the community colleges.

In providing the kind of administrative support that we want for a good professional development program, we have to look at resources. This might be in terms of a certain percentage of the operating budget which might be earmarked for instructional development so that we have some clearly defined amounts of money to do some things with over and above our regular travel funds.

Certainly time is of the essence, and we may need to set aside

some prescribed times during the week or during the year to allow faculty the time to attend workshops and other developmental activities. Too often we make an attempt at the beginning of the school year to devote some time to workshops and then forget about the effort during the rest of the year. Yet a good instructional improvement program has to be an ongoing thing, not a one-shot attempt. One effective device is to provide some kind of faculty steering committee that can approach the concerns from the viewpoint of the faculty. Although an administrative fiat from on high is likely to generate faculty resentment about a program, a steering committee on instructional development needs administrative support in terms of how to work out the mechanics the things the faculty wants to do.

For three years now Seattle Central has had an advanced institutional program, and last year we were able to earmark about ninety thousand dollars and the same amount this year for an instructional development program. Most of this money went for faculty workshops of various kinds, interviewing skills, crisis intervention, time management, problem solving, and so forth.

The program that seemed to be particularly well received was a series of workshops which tried to help faculty understand the nontraditional student. As an inner-city college, Seattle Central serves a high proportions of disadvantaged and minority students with a great many problems which they bring to the campus. The average age of our students is 29, and the average reading level for that student population is eighth grade. We have a tremendous remedial education job to do there. The most effective workshops were those that dealt with how to work with students who have a drug or alcohol addiction. This program was an eye-opener for many instructors in helping them to realize why students were behaving the way they were in a particular classroom.

Seattle Central also has a very large handicap program for deaf and blind students. Now that we are going to be required to make our instructional programs accessible for handicapped students, the classroom instructor is facing some real challenges in terms of how to provide training in the classroom for the blind student, the deaf student, for the wheel chair student. Our faculty has responded extremely well to the problems of working with the nontraditional kinds of students.

We have also offered personalized teaching clinics in which the faculty are invited to use videotape recordings of their classroom presentations. So far, only a relatively few faculty have availed themselves of this opportunity, but once they get over the initial trauma of seeing themselves in real life on the tape, this has proved to be a very helpful device. For every participating teacher, some good learning has taken place through that kind of videotape.

All of these programs have been most useful at Seattle Central.

JOHN FRIESEN, University of Calgary, panelist

My position on this panel and my position in the academic world are singular; I speak as a teacher.

The improvement of teaching is the proper concern of anyone involved in that activity. In fact, one could almost say that teaching and its improvement are synonymous concepts. Improvement of teaching might be defined as, "the steps a person takes to improve his/her efforts to transmit the knowledge or insights of a particular field with which he is more familiar than those whom he is trying to educate." It should be reasonable to expect that such an individual would constantly attempt to improve his style and technique. Students have a right to expect that their teachers are expert in their area of knowledge and they deserve more in a course than the exchange of shallow insights or ignorances. A teacher should be a master of technique. He may vary the pace and intensity of the teaching situation, and occasionally even include activities that resemble games or lighter tactics. It is even possible that if a teacher has taught well in a given term his students may become sufficiently versed in their subject that they may challenge the claims of their mentor, revealing near collegial mastery.

A teacher who takes himself seriously will work hard at self-improvement. This may take the form of a frequent change of textbooks or reading lists for students as a means of rethinking old ideas and gathering new ones. Classroom techniques ought to change as well. In philosophy of education, for example (my field), students are asked to work with ambiguous arguments; for

interest's sake, these might be drawn from current sources such as statements made by an educator, politician, or social critic. These would update the activity and serve as a supplement to the usual writings which philosophy of education students are asked to read.

There are, of course, many other ways to improve teaching, and sometimes instructors may team up to try a new approach. few years ago we did just that in the department in which I work, with the result that we put an entire course featuring team teaching on tape for television presentation. The outcome was a mess, basically because of some individuals' fear of the media and the use of graduate students as interpreters of the taped lectures. Students were so disgusted with the experiment that if we had not abandoned it for the next year, they might have burned down the building. In fact, I think I might have lit the match for them because the presentations were quite unfortunate. There have been other attempts in our faculty to improve teaching; for example, one year we tried what we called the "cluster approach." It had nothing to do with peanuts, although it may have belonged in the nut section, but consisted of keeping all students majoring in the same area in the same sections of each course they enrolled in. The purpose was to provide the students with continuity and familiarity, but instead they experienced much more course overlap than they needed. Each course, it appears, was doing something that year on "Bloom's Taxonomy of Values," and a student asked me halfway through my course in philosophy of education when I was going to do "Bloom's!" So we abandoned that approach, too, and each instructor went his own way doing his own thing using himself as a judge on content and method.

Probably, the most effective teacher improvement emphasis in Canada came from the wrong ranks--students instead of teachers. At the university level it came from such institutions as British Columbia's Simon Fraser University, where student displeasures with faculty eventually took such forms as sit-ins, black-listing, and other union-like tactics. In Montreal, at Sir George University, students smashed a million-dollar computer system as a means of getting attention for such things as poor teaching, lack of interest in students, etc. At the University of Calgary, we jumped the gun on students, afraid that they might smash our

$7.95 Radio Shack desk calculator. We elected them to high office to committees devised for the purpose of evaluation and improvement of instruction. The first committee was charged with finding a definition of good teaching, but after three months' work, they begged to be released from their impossible assignment. A second committee attempted to make a list of teaching activities which could be dichotomized into two nice compartments, good teaching and bad teaching. I never saw the list they drew up, but they, too, disbanded after several months of trying to get cooperation from people involved. It may well be that their list contained more items depicting bad teaching than good and they grew disheartened. Who could blame them?

At present, student evaluations are upon us and threaten to be the basic component in determining good teaching. And why not? Deans, department chairmen, and other responsible people are not accustomed to visiting classrooms to check the quality of teaching anyway. The present scale used by student evaluations goes from one to five with the latter signifying the highest level of performance. Items of concern include teaching style, pronunciation, assignments, office hours, etc., and the sum total is supposed to be related to such concerns as tenure and promotion. Unfortunately, the correlation between the two factors is likely too high although there is some evidence that faculty are not given tenure because of low student evaluations. The accompanying rituals of some of the evaluations is actually quite elaborate. At the University of Calgary the check lists are returned to the department involved by a student. Instructors are not to see them until the registrar has finalized all course grades.

Student evaluations have paralleled the phenomenon of student membership on faculty committees. In a sense, this move has precipitated an interesting idea: how can the learner assess the performance of a person who is teaching things the learner apparently has little or no familiarity with? It may come as quite a blow to some self-respecting professors who have spent fifteen years in an area only to have their performance evaluated by a person with three weeks experience in the same field.

The University of Calgary also features teaching workshops for faculty although these tend to be poorly attended. Some of the topics treated have a great deal of relevance to teaching improve-

ment, but there are always a few "gimmicky" titles as well. For example, did you know that a multi-media presentation consists of two movie projectors running at the same time? I did attend one workshop on student teaching led by some nice people from The University of Texas and The University of California. It had to do with testing and grading and constituted one session of a whole series. In that day I managed to pick up one valuable insight which is not bad compared to what some students have to say about courses they have been in. I only hope these have not been any I have been responsible for!

There has also been a trend in Alberta for members of faculties to meet together to discuss mutual concerns. In educational foundations, for example, the three Alberta faculties have met to discuss ideas on teaching undergraduates and graduates, subject matter emphases, and the future of our disciplines. These meetings have not entirely been unfruitful.

Finally, and this may be a bit more of a philosophical point, it seems that when we come to PNCHE meetings we inevitably divide into two camps--universities and community colleges. Some may wish to whitewash the difference, but personally, I see this line of demarcation as justifiable and necessary. Some community college presidents actually scorn research, a commodity which universities emphasize. It is true that universities reward their faculty more for research than teaching, but this is not an arbitrary procedure. If institutions of higher learning wish to attract government attention and receive additional funding, they have to speak the language of the industrial model--production. In the case of the university, this means research. Added to this, of course, is the vital truth that research is valuable. Many discoveries in medicine, engineering, human relations, etc., have originated with universities. It may be true that a great deal of trivia has also been pumped out in the name of research, but the wheat can usually be separated from the chaff.

Community colleges are quite another entity with their emphasis on lifelong learning, adult education, and academic meltings. They manufacture courses in ways that would make many a stalwart academician squirm and then give credit for them. Moreover, such activities are necessary in order that the community may be

served and that people may learn. However, to equate such with serious research or even with scholarly development is quite another thing. I do not see this difference in purpose between college and university as a battle or even a debate. Both are essential components of higher education, but they are not the same. They are distinct. When it comes to improvement of teaching, however, it applies to both institutions because people are involved.

LARZETTE HALE, Utah State University, panelist

As a female department chairman, with only male faculty, I am very mindful of the male ego. So, at the Utah State University in the Department of Accounting, we try to plan together. We have tried to determine what kinds of competencies a student graduate should have after completing our program at Utah State. This effort has been healthy because it has helped us define the kinds of services which the University's Instructional Development Program can provide us. This program is a facilitating unit that permits the department to do what we think is necessary to improve the quality of instruction and, rather than hand down an assignment, allows teachers on their own to go and change the quality of their instruction.

We have tried to address the need to change the kinds of things that we are doing in the classroom and the need to produce the kind of graduate who can function effectively within the environment in which accounting exists in the United States. Out of this effort has come response to and use of the Center by some and a complete ignoring of it by others. That kind of result is of course expected, because this is only one approach to the improvement of instruction.

Now, what do we do as an institution, not as a department? The goals of the Instructional Development Center at Utah State are to create a better instructional environment for teaching and learning by (1) providing consultation to the faculty on instructional problems and implementing systematically derived solutions, (2) encouraging departmentwide analysis of curriculum content and fostering improved departmental instruction, (3) providing financing and staff for approved faculty-initiated projects, thereby

enabling the institution to respond to reasonable faculty requests for instructional materials, (4) initiating universitywide grading of teaching, and (5) supporting improvement of extension and continuing education instruction.

Utah State also carries on awareness activities by providing occasional newsletters and articles about issues in educational innovation. These consist of reports of successful innovations by colleges and announcements of the application opportunities for mini-grants and development grants. The mini-grants encourage a teacher to develop new materials by providing from $200 up to $500. These development grants are for a quarter and provide released time during this period to develop an idea, although the actual trying out of the idea takes a longer time and the results usually begin to show after a year's time. I have had two such grants myself and have found them very rewarding and helpful in restructuring completely an accounting theory course, including the development of a tape/slide presentation as well as new teaching material. The Center is an excellent facilitating unit. For new faculty we also have teaching materials which include suggestions and resources for improvement of instruction.

One direct but effective approach to the improvement of instruction that we practice at Utah State is to develop high-level seminars that demand the updating of one's information in order to participate. For instance, in November we will have an accounting seminar with four speakers of national reputation in the accounting profession. On the part of the faculty, this forthcoming event has generated a tremendous amount of reading, updating, and injecting into the classroom situation many of the current things going on in the profession of accounting. When the guests come, at least the faculty want to be intelligent!

As department chairman, I have not said a thing about what the faculty ought to do. We have just divided the resources to make them available to those who wish to use them, and we encourage them to do so. Our president has made it very clear that it is the responsibility of the chairman of their own faculty to improve things that the chairman thinks are important, to share them with the faculty, and to factor them into the evaluation of the faculty. So as a chairman, if you think that scholarly activities include

more than basic research, you should make that attitude clear to your faculty and you should factor that into your evaluation. If you think one should have credit for good teaching, you ought to give it. Nine times out of ten a dean will respect your assessment of your faculty if you are fair.

When I came aboard on July 1 we were fortunate to have a new dean of the College of Business, who immediately gathered the department chairmen and center directors and established a strategic planning committee. We were to determine what the role of the College of Business should be, where we are going, and how we are going to get there. This ongoing discussion helped us tremendously in understanding our responsibility. One of the things the planning committee has done is to redesign what we mean by scholarly activity; it involves more than basic research. We have presented this plan to the administration, and we think it will have considerable influence in developing a reward system which gives credit to all the things that we think are important, including reward for improvement of teaching.

JOHN HOUSLEY, Linfield College, panelist

My comments are very much from the point of view of a small private liberal arts college of about one thousand students. From that point of view, I'd like to begin with two disagreements which might be of some importance.

First in my view is that there is much stronger institutional identification in our faculty at Linfield than there is a discipline indentification. The opposite statement was made this morning as a kind of norm in the academic profession. I think that probably is true overall, particularly in the large institutions. But one of the things that is different about a small, private liberal arts college is that you have a pretty stable faculty and they tend to identify more with the needs and problems of Linfield, in this case, than perhaps with what is going on in political science, history, or the other academic disciplines.

Now this situation has some obvious disadvantages and you get some parochialism and the other things that go with it. On the other hand, there is the possibility of developing certain levels of trust and interaction that you might not have in a fully depart-

mentalized, discipline-oriented faculty. So at Linfield we tend to get a certain homogeneity, if not ideological position, at least of identification.

The other disagreement really has to do with a luncheon conversation which I felt was very stimulating. I would simply say that there has to be a very close relationship between the evaluation of teaching and improvement of teaching or instruction, and there ought to be some kind of systematic effort at putting these things together. Otherwise, it seems to me, we are just playing around with different models, or whether it is to be two projectors, or whether it is a non-synchronized tape presentation. We are being very dilettante in this business of instructional development if we are not attempting to say what it is we are trying to improve and on what basis.

I am convinced from my very brief experience at Linfield that we are wrong to try to separate the what from the how, or putting it back in the jargon of faculty development, the relationship between academic development and institutional development. I do not feel that you can put in bifurcation here and talk simply about how to do it better without being very serious about what it is you are communicating.

A year ago Linfield College had no system at all of evaluating teaching or the activities of the faculty as a whole, and certainly there was no commitment whatsoever to faculty development. Currently, we do have both of these things. I do not attribute that just to my presence, for part of this is the spirit of the times. But we indeed now do have what we feel is a fairly reasonable integration of evaluation and development activities. For the first time we have been able to get actual funds allocated not only to evaluation, but to development. We have been able to secure a small foundation grant. As has been mentioned earlier, we are members now of a small consortium of schools which will concern itself with faculty development.

In particular, we have been able to establish, with very strong faculty approval, a faculty development team on campus, made up of faculty members and chaired by a faculty member, whose purpose is to push the whole endeavor. As dean, I take a great deal of interest in this effort and try to work with the team, but whether anything really is happening and will happen in the future

is up to that group of faculty in the final analysis.

We felt at Linfield that we did need some means of evaluating, although we knew there are no perfect instruments. So we worked out, through faculty committees, a system of evaluation which indeed does include student evaluation, serious colleague evaluation, and self-evaluation, with appropriate forms and a timetable whereby both tenured and nontenured faculty are to be regularly evaluated. A very important part of this process is the absolute insistence on the part of the faculty that there be personal interviews between the faculty member being evaluated, the department head, and the dean, so that a great deal of time is invested in one-on-one discussion of the various results of peer, student, and self-evaluations.

This process is providing an important linkage over to the faculty development side. Not just that the administration says to Professor X, "Well, you have these crummy evaluations; therefore, we are going to send you to this workshop so you learn to speak and whatever." We are trying to work things out together, and what kinds of investments the institution might make--whether it is a major investment like retraining, sending our faculty somewhere to learn how to be something else, or funds for developing a new course or new ways of doing the course, for research, or for workshops coming out of the development experience.

The faculty rightly insisted on an administrative commitment, a budget broken down with the total number of dollars at the bottom to show how they are being spent for faculty development. The faculty development team is very much involved in the expenditure of these particular funds that have been budgeted. It may have been a little easier for us to bring this all about because we are a small college and relatively homogeneous, but as a result of what I have been describing I think a level of trust is beginning to develop between faculty and administration that was not apparent before. The important ingredient is that it is a genuine joint endeavor.

Finally, in joining the small professional development consortium with Evergreen, Portland State, University of Puget Sound, Reed, and Willamette, we have found that we really have a catalyst, that is, some agent from outside, which has undergirded what we

were doing and has helped to nudge us along in this process.

GILLIARD, moderator

I think that we are getting a consensus that all parts of the university or campus have a role to play in instructional development. We are not isolated in closets by ourselves after all, for efforts are going on at various levels in all kinds of schools. The problems of improvement of teaching apply to all of us and all of our institutions.

Stuart Knapp has a rather advanced program of instructional development here at Oregon State University. He will comment on his role as dean of undergraduate studies and on OSU's instructional development activities.

STUART E. KNAPP, Oregon State University, panelist

I would like to comment first about how I became interested in this whole area of improvement of teaching. When I was a graduate student in zoology and a teaching assistant, we were programmed to do things a certain way because that was the style and the tradition on zoologists throughout the years. One thing that always burned me up in parasitology and zoology was that every specimen that someone gave us was preserved in a glass vial, and you did not see it in its original color, you did not get to feel it, you did not get to listen to it, you did not get stung by it, you were really insulated from what something really was. When I came to OSU, I tried to teach by what I thought was a more viable technique. We did experiments, we got live animals, we set up designs, we caused things to happen, we evaluated those instances and measured and felt and did everything else that you can with live material. Ever since that time, I have really been interested in teaching and helping to promote a kind of teaching that is dynamic rather than static.

Now as an administrator, the model I see as serving as dean of undergraduate students in a large university is as a doorman. You can be two kinds of doorpeople. You can be the kind that holds the door closed or you can be the kind that holds the door

open. I see my job as holding the door open at Oregon State. There are many faculty members at OSU who are good teachers, who want to do creative work in teaching, and who need help in doing this. It is not our role in administration to tell them what to do. It is our responsibility to help people get the kind of assistance they think they need to cut the red tape and to be there to assist whenever that assistance is called for.

The Office of Dean of Undergraduate Studies at OSU was created to identify someone who could focus attention on the needs of the undergraduate students. The first university in the Oregon State System of Higher Education to create that position was Portland State University. The position is now established in other institutions in Oregon and in a number of universities around the country. At each institution the position has its own individual characteristics or set of responsibilities.

At Oregon State the office reports directly to the president. Undergraduate Studies is a kind of development office. We also manage a series of programs that I define as the academic services. These services include the honors program, instructional research and materials, the educational opportunities program, undergraduate level interdisciplinary studies, general education programs, advanced placement and credit by examination, advising credit for experiential learning, the National Student Exchange Program, and almost anything else affecting undergraduates in an academic way that nobody can fit into other programs. Improvement of instruction is a good example of the latter and is under my office.

My office tries to help find funds for faculty to go to other schools or colleges or programs in industry or the private sector to learn about new developments that can help them in their teaching. Like Utah State, for example, we also provide small grants (mini-grants) for promising instructional development projects. The maximum grant is eighteen hundred dollars, and usually fourteen or fifteen are given per year. My office retrieves the information about what was done with the funds and makes it available to the campus. In addition to the mini-grants, we also have some funds available to help faculty get free for part-time to work on course improvement or development of instruction.

One of our most successful instructional development efforts so far has been the College and University Teaching Project (CAUT). This project came about after funds ran out for a teaching improvement program that was administered by the Oregon Educational Coordinating Council. During the time the latter project was in operation over a million dollars were awarded on a competitive basis to faculty from Oregon State System of Higher Education institutions and community colleges.

The Oregon State University faculty was very competitive for these grants and over a period of four years obtained 28 grants. But we began to find that while the programs looked good on paper, when the faculty started to work in their programs, they had problems. They especially needed consulting help; strangely enough, they just needed other instructional innovators to talk to. In fact, we found that faculty really needed the same kind of services for the development of instruction as the faculty need for the development of research.

After four years, the Educational Coordinating Council's funds ran out. In the meantime OSU had awarded some grant support from its own resources but still we found that after the faculty got the money they had difficulties in developing their programs. For several years we have had a series of instructional services which have included Classroom Television, the Computer Center, and IRAM (the Instructional Resources and Materials Center). We decided to add to IRAM an instructional development consultant, and to initiate the CAUT project.

CAUT is a year-long program beginning in the summer, and dedicated to the development of new modes of instruction. We started CAUT four years ago and it continues to gain momentum. So far 120 OSU instructors and several from the Oregon community colleges and other state system institutions have gone through the program. Participants are selected on the basis of their interest in instructional development. Stipends are provided for attendance at the summer institute, and funds are made available during the ensuring year to provide free time and materials to the participant for development of the plans worked out in the summer workshop.

The summer workshops have been conducted by some of the outstanding people in the field of instructional development--Sam

Postlethwait from Purdue University, Charlie Wales from West Virginia State University, Ben Green from Empire State University, Jerry Kemp from the University of California at San Jose, and for the Summer of 1978, Robert Ruskin from George Washington University. The CAUT participants go back to their departments, develop their projects, and in turn work with their colleagues in implementing the new techniques. There are seminars during the year, and eventually an evaluation at the end of the year. Several projects, by the way, have resulted in the production of published papers and there have been numerous other "spin offs" as well, including most importantly improved learning conditions for the students.

BARRY NOONAN, Portland Community College, panelist

One thing that I am faced with as curriculum coordinator at Portland Community College is that we are a very large institution. We have about sixty thousand individual head count, about fourteen thousand FTE so it is really impossible to institute staff development activities for all faculty.

It is extremely appropriate at Portland Community College for instructional development to operate out of the president's office. President De Bernárdis is committed to instructional improvement at our institution. He knows what he is looking for; he knows what he is going after: and therefore, he can best get the job done he is charged with as the leader of our institution by having someone in his office directly.

I spend half of my time working directly with the instructors and the deans of instructional development, probably sixty percent with vocational technical programs and forty percent college transfer programs. I try to differentiate, if I can, between professional development and institutionally support instructional development. There is a great deal of instructional development that goes on, just as there is a great deal of learning that goes on, which really is not tied to the institution as such; but my comments are limited here just to the institutionally supported instructional development activities.

We have been asked to speak to the purpose, the need, the cost

of instructional development, and where, when, and who should be involved. I see the purpose of education, and therefore instructional development, as that of helping the student to become whatever he or she is capable, interested, and motivated to become as a citizen, a consumer, a producer, a family member, and an individual. Institutionally supported instructional development is a similar process for the faculty member. It is a process of becoming what the faculty member is capable of, is interested in, and is motivated to become as an educator. Through institutionally supported instructional development we should help the faculty member realize his or her greatest potential as an inspiration and as a resource person.

I say this because over and over again one of the problems that I run into, as a curriculum specialist, is some kind of preconceived notion that the purpose is to modularize, audio-visualize, can or video-tape the presentations, and put them into some kind of sterile environment so that the teacher will no longer have any role. If we go back to the concept of becoming, the student becoming, the instructor becoming, the faculty member becoming, I hope that we can dispel the concept of some kind of automated, robot-like, stereotyped, audio-visual instructional process. I completely agree with Stuart Knapp that one of the most important ingredients for the developing instructor is to have someone to talk to. That is one of the key roles of our instructional development program at Portland Community College --not to guide them into some preconceived mode of instruction, but to provide the faculty with opportunity to talk with others about the improvement of their classroom instruction.

We suggested this morning that instructional development should possibly focus mostly on the new instructor. But I find at our institution, and other institutions where I have worked, that the experienced instructor also needs help. In fact, sometimes it is the experienced teacher who profits more because he or she has gotten over the initial problems of classroom teaching and has reached the point of looking for ways to be more effective. The new instructors are sometimes so immediately involved in dealing with the media problems or surviving as an instructor that they are not really ready. It is an overload for them and they just have a difficult time handling it.

Because of time limits, I want to narrow my focus to just one facet of instructional development, the analysis of what the instructor is trying to teach. As instructional developers, one of our most important functions is helping the instructor define what it is he wants the students to know and be able to do upon completion of a given project that they are working on. In our fluid kind of environment with all kinds of students coming in with an endless array of problems, I do not support the development of rigid statements of performance objectives. But in talking with instructors of college parallel courses as well as vocational-technical instructors, I find that often there is a lack of definition of what the standards of excellence are and of the means of measuring those standards. When an instructor comes to us interested in instructional development, our first step is to help him sit down and think out what his standards of excellence are, what kinds of things he wants a student to know and be able to do, not the minimum competencies, but the point of view and the broad objectives.

At Portland Community College we do not tie institutionally supported instructional development in with evaluation of the instructor. It would be very threatening to our teachers to have them think they are being pushed into working on objectives because we have somehow evaluated that they are not competent. I am scheduled from eight in the morning to five at night to meet with instructors. We make the opportunity known, but I wait for them to call.

I make myself available for dialogue with any instructor or group of instructors for as long a period of time as necessary. Sometimes into a three-year kind of experience. I have met with one sociology instructor each week for two years just talking about what he is doing in his course. I do not try to sway him one way or the other. We spent four years on redevelopment of our whole two-year welding program and have done the same kind of thing in speech, sociology, and other areas. Out of this process, the instructor develops a document which states, to the best of the instructor's knowledge, what it is the student should know and be able to do. The plan can be revised at any time.

Once the objectives are established, then we move, if they wish, into instructional strategies: development of teaching materials;

clear, direct, concise presentation of material. I am available to help with those processes also and they can take years.

GILLIARD

From the remarks of our panelists we have begun to get a sense of the state of the art of instructional development in our region. We also get a sense of what instructional development can be and of a few of the trends that are beginning to emerge. Now, based on what we have heard today about instructional development programs in particular institutions, let us move to the potential we can see for a regional consortium for instructional development.

Clearly two or three things emerge. First and foremost is that instructional development is a very broad term, and what it means precisely is a little difficult to say. It can mean anything from a systems approach to a very general, facilitating sort of approach whereby it is determined that the faculty are competent to do things. What they need is effort, time, money, and assistance from the administration to develop their ideas. The other is a very systematic approach whereby you analyze the problem, create an instructional design, find some way to implement it (which almost always means administration comes up with money), and you evaluate it. All of those things can be instructional development.

We also see from today's presentations that we have in this region a great wealth of resource people, types of programs, kinds of situations, that each of us ought to be able to draw on. We need to share that kind of wealth, and that seems to lead to the idea of a consortium. There are some things that we can do together as a group that might be more efficient and more effective in motivating teaching than just sticking within our own institution and our own resources.

I'd like to throw the idea of the consortium open to the panel and to the audience to discuss what kind of consortium or consortia we might develop, what kinds of services you would like to see a consortium provide, what kinds of programs you would like to see, what kinds of things can you contribute from your institution.

Let's address the issue first of what kind of consortium should we have? One, many? What kinds of things seem feasible? Anyone on the panel?

NOONAN

Another question might be about the need. We get very busy doing our own thing at our own institution but you know, it is very difficult to find out what is going on in the Northwest. So I fee there is a need. I would not want us to get bogged down in a bunch of meetings, but some way of communicating with each other in the area of instructional development would be very beneficial.

GILLIARD

So one service a consortium could provide would be to set up a systematic vehicle for sharing information. Be it a newsletter, be it a series of position papers, whatever, it might distribute descriptions of promising programs or strategies, circulate questions and solicit answers on vexing individual problems, direct people to sources on information about small faculty grants, computer-assisted instruction, and so forth, or identify resource people in our region who might come to consult with our faculty about specific problems.

HOUSELY

I think that if you are going to have a consortium, it ought to be very much action-oriented. The business of sharing information in newsletters or visiting another institution can be done without any great or formal structure. The small consortium that I referred to earlier, ASPEN, the Associate Schools of the Pacific Northwest, is designed not just to facilitate the sharing of information. Its purpose is actually to carry out a program, primarily what none of us or at least most of us were not in a position to do by ourselves, either financially or in terms of available expertise. It also is a great catalyst for organizing our own efforts, certainly for those of us at Linfield. So if there is a need, it would be a

need for getting some things actually done that you either cannot do or probably will not do if you are not associated with some kind of group. We need not only information; we also need some way to get some action on the information we have.

HALE

I think, also, we are talking about consortia and not a consortium. The Northwest as a whole is too large to really get something done. Perhaps, we ought to proceed in clusters of institutions or programs.

GILLIARD

We might use the term consortia, then, to describe some kind of network of cooperative arrangements about instructional development. I agree that the concept, "Northwest Consortium", defines a very large entity. Geographically it is enormous, to say nothing of the fact that sixty-five thousand students at Portland Community College present a radically different problem from one thousand at Linfield, a private liberal arts college. Maybe, however, there are groups of compatible interests and compatible problems wherein similar techniques would apply and for which we could make effective cooperative arrangements. A mega thing like a Northwest Consortium might distribute information or might get some money from the federal government that it could redistribute, but it would probably not be the the effective action agent that Dean Housely was describing in the ASPEN group--Evergreen, Portland State, Willamette, Linfield, and the University of Puget Sound.

We are beginning to set up an association like that in the Intermountain Region, between Utah State, Idaho State University, Weber State College, and Boise State University, because we share similar geographic features, similar kinds of studentbodies, and similar faculty and organizational structure, although not exactly parallel. We are all state-supported schools of about the same size with the same kinds of problems with our legislatures. We feel there are certain kinds of things that we can do better cooperatively than we can do singly. For one thing, it is very

expensive to duplicate programs. It costs a lot more money for me to generate the same thing that one of these other schools has done, than it does for me to find out how they have done it, bring it over to Idaho State, and see if some of our faculty want to adapt it to their particular purposes.

Another kind of program that a regional consortium or network or consortia ought to be interested in is faculty exchange. That, too, is a cost-effective measure for a multitude of reasons. We have faculty who are going to have to be transferred to other areas of teaching because of shifts in enrollment and other kinds of patterns. It is not necessarily desirable to fire an instructor. People can be retrained, and one way of retraining them is faculty exchange. Then, too, we have people on our campus who may be able to help solve some problem that you have; you have people that can help us solve problems. That is another dimension of faculty exchange. Faculty exchange seems to me to be one of the most promising kinds of institutional renewal and instructional development effort. However, it is one of the most difficult to arrange. Hence, I sent the questionnaire, because you have to work out salary, cost-of-living increases, travel, compatible calendars, withholdings, retirement benefits, and all kinds of problems. But, if you can make it work, it pays dividends all around.

I must caution, however, that consortia are not cost saving for the member institutions. The benefits you get are many, but it is not cash from a consortium. You get exchange of information, new ideas, the halo effect of people working on things cooperatively, that kind of positive Hawthorne effect that shows up. You get resource people, you get resource material, you get curriculum guides and programs, but you do not get money. That is one thing that we have to disabuse people of, that a consortium is a place to get funds.

I think now that we have had enough input from our discussion to ask the Conference steering committee, at the executive session tomorrow, to consider that there are varying stages of active instructional development programs going on in the region, and the steering committee might want to undertake investigation of cooperative arrangements among institutions in PNCHE to promote the improvement of teaching/learning through faculty development or instructional development. I realize that faculty development and

instructional development are different terms and have different implications. Perhaps, that might be one basis for identifying the consortia. It may be that institutions interested in faculty development, with its emphasis on the faculty member, could be one group. Those more interested in the instructional development process might be another.

I would like to add that what I work for on my own campus is instructional development, not faculty development. One reason is that "faculty development" carries with it that connotation of remedial action which my faculty, as a liberal arts college, would strongly resent. The University of Idaho is the land grant school in Idaho. We are the liberal arts college. The idea or remediation just would not sit well, so I avoid that term.

The other reason I think in terms of instructional development and not faculty development is that faculty teach in the classroom with students, and what they are involved in there is instruction. Instruction is a two-way process, and it demands two kinds of participants. You have to have at least two people in the room, and you have to have one instructor and one instructee. You have no choice about the given framework. Even if the roles shift, even if the two people in the room trade off as to who is going to be instructor and instructee at various times, at any given set of the interchange there are those two roles to be occupied. I would call it instructional development because we are talking about that place where learning happens and where there are two people involved. Faculty development can become a situation where only one is being considered. That is the stance from which I operate.

IS OUR MONEY WHERE OUR MOUTH IS?

Introductory Remarks: STEFEN BLOOMFIELD

Of Dr. Hartung's recent career, all that really needs to be said is that for 12 years he was President of the University of Idaho. He is now President emeritus and is the Executive Director of the University of Idaho Foundation, which is the external fund-raising arm of the University of Idaho.

ERNEST HARTUNG, University of Idaho

The area or sort of coverage you have asked me to explore with you is far from restrictive. Rather than leap into the saddle and ride off in all directions at once, however, I decided that it might be best to keep the approach simple--possible, even somewhat simplistic--and see if we might not be able to come up with a sort of answer to the question in general terms. In addition, I have hopes that in developing the rationale for an answer I might even go so far as to suggest that possibly the question posed in the title is not the basic one.

Higher education today is characterized, as it has been for years and years, by an intellectual ferment that seeks new approaches, that seeks better ways of teaching, of developing teachers, of using new technology, and generally of broadening our horizons. At the same time, it is also characterized by a conservatism and in inertial resistence to basic change which goes down to its very roots.

If both of these characterizations are valid, and I think I can establish that validity in the next several minutes, than I would suggest that the answer to our title question is by all means an affirmative one.

One need only to leaf through the brochures, the announcements, the invitations for grant applications of many governmental and privately endowed foundations to realize that very significant sums of money are ready and waiting to assist with the exploration of the new horizons which many educators would seek to probe. Words such as "innovative," "pioneering," "pilot programs," and "seeking new ideas," abound in the descriptions of the kind of projects for which subvention is offered. And, I believe, the record will show in terms of grants made or contracts let that goodly sums of money have, in fact, been invested by these agencies and organizations in the cause of innovation.

On the other side of the coin--the conservative side--any of you who have ever had a part of trying to induce a state legislature to appropriate funds for higher education are well aware that items such as accreditation, applied research, stability in both faculty and student body, are all areas in which substantial "brownie

points" are to be secured if properly emphasized. Few of you, I am sure, would disagree that most accreditation standards as now set by professional accrediting bodies are conservative. Applied research is also by its very nature generally conservative. There are, of course, exceptions but it equally proves the point that the exceptions are not usually big point scorers with legislatures.

At Indiana University, for example, when the entomologist, Professor Kinsey, was applying his work to Caddis flies, he was regarded as a solid and respected scientist. When his work moved over into preliminary investigations of human sexuality, the Indiana Legislature, not to mention even some of his own faculty colleagues took a very dim view, and even suggested that his work be stopped. The student and faculty radicalism of the '60's and early '70's did little to win popular support for higher education, but it is possible to cite several collegiate institutions which were the beneficiaries of substantial largess purely on the grounds they had no evidences of student or faculty radicalism, even during the height of the troubled times. A fair summary might be that, "We want our institutions to be progressive, but conservatively so." In short, I see no reason not to believe that if we keep on exploring innovative approaches at the same time maintaining a basically conservative overall posture, we shall continue to receive reasonably good financial support.

The paradox, of course, lies in the idea that even if innovation and experiment seem to prove successful, the basic posture will remain essentially conservative and will not change all that much. Let me illustrate with a concrete example in terms of education.

Most of you here can probably recall the tremendous impact which the launching of the first manmade satellite--Sputnik I--by the Soviet Union, had upon this entire nation, but most notably upon the scientific community and the graduate schools of the country which in the final analysis were the breeding grounds of past and future scientists. Stimulated by tremendous Federal investment through such programs as the National Defense Education Act, established graduate schools expanded dramatically and new graduate schools emerged in smaller universities almost like mushrooms following a sudden wet spell.

All of this ferment created tremendous pressure for new facilities, for new equipment, but most significantly, for new faculty to help with what was then viewed as the almost overwhelming task of educating the thousands upon thousands of new graduate students we felt we would need. At the forefront were, as might be expected, those who cried out for new and innovative approaches to graduate education as the only way to get the job done. New degrees, new routes to old degrees, teaching as opposed to research degrees, the scrapping of the traditional Ph.D. and Ed.D. degrees as obsolete and no longer suited to the times--these themes were repeated and explored and reiterated endlessly in conferences (similar I suppose to this one) throughout the nation.

In the midst of the furor, there appeared a book entitled Graduate Education in the United States, written by Bernard Berelson. This book, in my view, remains today, even some 17 years or so after its publication, one of the best analyses of the realities of graduate education that has been done. In a dispassionate way, Berelson first pointed out that viewed in historical perspective, there was nothing new in the "Sturm and Drang" through which we were going in the post-Sputnki era. Even prior to the turn of the century, immediately after, and on numerous occasions right up to 1959-60, he cites proceedings of conferences, "white papers" written by distinguished panels of educators, and solo treatises, quotes from which could have equally emerged from any one of the numerous post-Sputnik sessions.

Moreover, in spite of the many cries for reform in doctoral degrees, Berelson actually conducted surveys among college and university presidents which demonstrated that the overwhelming majority, when asked what qualifications they would specify (given carte blanche) for teaching positions on their faculties, indicated that they would favor the traditional Ph.D.

Given these facts, Berelson then went on to suggest that allowing a few minor changes in our traditional patterns, the likelihood was very great that our then current programs could do the job, could handle both the production of new faculties and new scientists in requisite members, and that any dislocations which might result from continued pursuit of solutions through traditional patterns would be brief and of little or no lasting consequence.

History, I believe, has proved the astuteness of Berelson's observations.

Which brings us back to the paradox suggested earlier of the obvious durability of the status quo in the face of almost constant pressure for new methodologies and for change. It is here that I would suggest that our title probably should not be "Is Our Money Where Our Mouth Is?" but "Is Our Mouth in the Right Place?" Having now spent over 30 years in the enterprise of higher education, I have come to conclude that we have systematically overlooked, or avoided because of its extreme difficulty the basic question "How do people learn?" What is the neurological basis for learning? Why do some people's memory banks function well under one set of circumstances and poorly under others? What is the anatomical and physiological basis which underlies an aptitude for mathematics in one person and an evident lack of it in another? If we direct our attention here, I believe we will find real "brave new worlds" of education out of which meaningful new methodologies can be developed. Short of getting this kind of knowledge, I fear we shall continue to go in the methodological circles which in the end make the status quo inevitable.

When I first studied a foreign language as a high school student in New York City, the approach was almost entirely vocabulary, grammar, verb forms, irregular verbs, etc. Occasional short paragraph auf Deutsch ended chapters in the text, but there was certainly little or no literature or attempt at conversation until well into the second year and even then what was attempted was limited. When my children first took language in elementary school in Rhode Island, I was interested and delighted to find that the approach was conversational, that there was little "grinding out" of vocabulary or verb forms and that such items came in due course as a linguistic capability, simple as it was at the start, emerged.

When I forst took introductory biology as a college student, the course pretty well began with plants and animals as functioning entities and moved system by system. In the course of digestion, for example, we learned of enzymes--catalysis--peptide linkages and similar elements of chemistry as we considered function.

A generation later when my son took introductory biology in college, I learned that the approach had changed. The course began with considerations of catalysts, energy exchanges, DNA, RNA, the replication of molecules, and a wide range of biochemical considerations. It was almost an entire semester before even a plan or animal was observed in the laboratory.

I was struck by the interesting idea that biology now seemed to be taught as I had learned language prior to WW II, while language now seemed to be taught as I had learned biology.

Obviously, there is probably oversimplification in this illustration, but I think it points out the methodological circles to which I referred. In this going in circles, I suspect we almost emulate a gyroscope not only in its spinning, but in the inertial stability and resistance to change which it achieves.

In light of the paucity of our knowledge concerning the absolutes of learning, much of the thrust of an innovative elan becomes dissipated in jargon with which we camouflage even from ourselves the fact that in much of what we call innovative changes we are often simply rediscovering that same wheel. Until we know more about the learning process, that wheel is probably as far as we can go in the way of real progress, irrespective of how often we rediscover it or by how many diverse routes.

Realistically, for example, is the idea that man has the capability of learning throughout most of his active life and is therefore presumably educable outside of schools or collegiate institutions, all that fantastic a concept? Or that probably the best teachers of a given subject will prove to be those who have a demonstrable competency base in it?

In Goethe's Faust, Mephistopheles at one point suggests that man tends to be uneasy with that which he does not understand. In order to eliminate this unease, he often puts a name or a title on the phenomenon and thereby convinces himself that he knows it or understands it.

As educators I suggest that we are as prone to falling into this error as any other group, but I would also suggest we probably ought to be more on our guard about it.

In conclusion, then, I would repeat that I do not think for the present, our money is where out mouth is, but I am not sure that any one of us really knows where that is. In this idiom, finding the right place for the mouth, I believe, is the ultimate challenge.

CLOSING THE GAPS: SOME ANSWERS FROM PCC

Introductory remarks: BARRY NOONAN, Portland Community College

This morning I have the privilege of introducing Dr. Amo De Bernardis, President of Portland Community College for 16 years. At PCC we refer to him as De. Dr. De is a controversial figure. I feel that De is an educational prophet from the Old Testament. He is an inspirational and firey leader; but he is outspoken and very direct, and there are many people who take exception to his philosophies and style of operation. But no matter what their philosophical position might be about education, it is difficult for people to argue with the success of Portland Community College.

Presently, PCC consists of eight campus centers, all administered out of one office. There are about sixty-five thousand students by individual head count, representing approximately 10 percent of the population in the five-county area that we cover. Though we do have campus managers on various campuses, there is not a traditional collegiate model of administration. We have the lowest cost per student of any educational institution in the State of Oregon. And much of this is the result of the leadership and the philosophy that De exemplifies.

Perhaps his leadership and philosophy are best demonstrated in the development of our new Rock Creek Center, which is located in Washington County at the geographic Center of our whole district. And Dr. De is going to talk with you this morning about the mission of PCC and the community-oriented philosophy of Rock Creek Center.

AMO De BERNARDIS, Portland Community College

The people who planned this conference made some assumptions: one, that the gaps in our educational system are between what we say and what we do. The second assumption was that PCC had some answers.

I believe everyone in the audience is well aware of the fact that we will never close all the gaps. There will never be the perfect solution to problems which deal with the human organization. This should not keep us from trying and this is what the conference is all about. We have the opportunity to consider how each of us approaches the problem of closing the gaps. Each of us in our own way will work towards the solution. The important thing is to know the direction.

This reminds me of a story. Two hunters brought down a large moose and were dragging it by the head towards their camp. They were having a difficult time as the large antlers would catch on the brush. At best, it was a frustrating experience. A trapper came along and suggested that they would make better progress if they pulled from the other end. By so doing the antlers would not hang up on the brush. They tried it and one hunter said to the other, "It sure is easier." "It sure is," said the second hunter, "but we are getting further away from our camp."

I hope that we in education pull from the right end and make sure that we are heading for camp.

As we consider closing the gaps between what we know and what we do, we should keep in mind how slow we are to make changes in educational practices. It has been pointed out that the minimum time from the inception of a new idea to its acceptance is 50 years. Some say 100 years. Many of us in this room have lived long enough to give a measure of support to this concept. Some of the new communication devices such as radio, television, and motion pictures have been around for a long time, yet their acceptance into the teaching and learning process is minimal. This resistance to change is one we need to keep in the back of our minds when we consider closing the gap. John Gardner makes the point that "most human organizations that fall short of their goals do so not because of stupidity or faulty doctrines, but

because of internal decay and rigidification. They grow stiff in the joints; they get in a rut. Then go to seed.""

Before I get into the discussion of what we are doing at our new Rock Creek Center, I want to set the stage of where Rock Creek is in our college operation. I find that we tend to react to labels. When you mention community college each of us builds an image of the institution. Often they look like a four-year college.

Portland Community College serves a population area of about 650,000 people. It has within its district boundaries the metro city of Portland, all of Washington County, and parts of four other counties. It has urban, rural, and everything in between.

The college is comprehensive in its program offerings which include vocational-technical, college parallel, high school completion, adult basic education, community education, and apprenticeship. The college is committed to meeting the educational needs of the people. If we do not have a program, we will develop one to meet specific needs.

The college considers the district as the campus. There is no main campus. We have many centers of varying sizes located close to where people live. At the present time, we operate eight centers in addition to using high schools and other facilities throughout the community. We believe that education must be readily accessible to the people of our district.

We are an open-door college. There are no admission requirements. We take people as they are. We make an attempt to help them reach their educational goal. They can leave at any time and reenter without penalty. We have no probationary policy. We do not ask students to leave because of slow or unsatisfactory progress. We recognize that for some students it takes a longer time to find themselves.

Our administrative structure varies considerably from the typical college organization. Our deans handle the total operation of the divisions; programs, administration, curriculum, personnel, etc. Some of them also act as center managers. We believe that this system helps to bridge the gap getween the academic

world and the vocational programs. Even though it does not fit the typical pattern, it seems to work for us.

It is in this context that we began to think about and plan the Rock Creek Center. The active planning began in 1969 when the Board asked me what we were planning for the proposed center in Washington County. At that meeting, I set forth some of the basic ideas and concepts which I though we should try to implement at Rock Creek. What I said that night are some of the topics we are discussing at this conference. I pointed out to the Board that we should make an attempt to put into practice what we say--narrow the gap between theory and practice.

I have always had a strong commitment to making a conscious effort to teach in light of what we know about the teaching and learning process. As an administrator I have tried to do the same thing. However, I am aware that there will always be gaps and inconsistencies between theory and practice.

Fundamental Concepts

People are different. We continually expound on this fact--we teach it, we preach it, but our practice leaves quite a gap. We tend to put students into the same mold, expecting them to respond to our teaching and our programs in a set way. There is little consideration given to the wide variance among human beings.

People learn in different ways. It is being recognized that some people learn better through visual means, others by doing, some by lecture, etc. They have different learning styles, yet our educational delivery system is based primarily on the lecture and the textbook.

Learning is a lifelong process. This is a known fact. Yet, we in education build barriers to this concept by the way we organize our programs in set time blocks; quarters, terms, and years. Graduation signifies completion. We have developed the idea that education takes place in school during a defined period of one's life. We must close the gap and develop the concept

that learning is lifelong and the institution is ready and willing to make its services available at all times.

All learning has dignity and worth. Learning is learning, no matter where one learns. Whether one learns to fix a car or learns to compute the strength of a beam, the process is the same and results in action. However, in our educational system we place a different value on academic and vocational learning. This gap needs to be narrowed. How does the filling of a tooth or constructing a set of dentures differ from machining a part for a car or adjusting the gyro compass on a ship? They all require knowledge and skill which had to be learned. Yet, in our social structure the dental skills are higher on the social scale. We need to narrow the gap and work towards giving dignity to both the dentist and the mechanic. Each has a contribution to make to society.

John Gardner highlights the idea. "An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than incompetent philosophers. The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water." We must develop an educational system which gives dignity and worth to all programs, and no student should apologize for his program.

Change is constant. Few would deny the fact that our society is always in a state of change. New knowledge is being added at an alarming rate. The developments in sciences and technology change our way of life. The modern world is dynamic and ever-changing. Yet, while we all recognize this fact, we in education resist any significant change in our methods, our material, our technology.

The thinking person. We make a significant point that education should open the student's mind, broaden his horizons, develop an objective approach to problem solving, etc. However, there is a considerable gap between what we teach and what we do. The classroom, the college, should be the laboratory for putting these ideas into practice. The student should have opportunities to analyze and make recommendations for the improvement of the

teaching and learning process.

Portland Community College's Rock Creek Center was conceived, planned, built, and operated with the idea of narrowing some of the gaps. With these guidelines we began to build and put the various pieces of the Rock Creek plan together. Keep in mind that the foundation for the building of Rock Creek was our college district or our community.

The first consideration was to set forth a philosophy which would make clear to everyone what the commitment would be. The door would be really open--not revolving. People could enter at any time--leave when they had achieved their goals--reenter when they wanted additional education.

The educational shopping center concept would be an important part of the Rock Creek plan. The center would make an attempt to provide a wide variety of educational experience to meet the needs of the people. Like a modern shopping center, it would be customer centered with services and products designed to meet the needs of the customers (the students).

Dignity and choice. We are committed to the idea that all programs, courses, and services are there to serve the student. No student should be made to feel that he is in a lower status program because it has a label of vocational, or another student considered to be in a higher status because he is in an academic program. We work hard at trying to bridge the mythical gap between vocational and academic. We believe that the student needs to feel that the program which is chosen has dignity and is supported and respected by the college.

The community is the campus. Portland Community College has from its beginnings looked upon the community as the campus. The college is where the classes are held. We have no main campus, each center, each classroom is the college for that student or group of learners. Our hope is to integrate the total community into the learning experience. The people, the shops, the stores, the factories, must become a part of the Rock Creek concept.

Rock Creek programs must flow through the community and the

community through the center. The center must become the catalyst for all kinds of learning activities, both at the center and in the community. Rock Creek cannot become an island removed from the active life of the community.

Needs assessment. Because of the dynamic nature of the community, it is necessary to continually monitor the educational needs of the people. Not only will the center be interested in selling its programs, but it will also be exploring new needs, new markets, and designing and tailoring programs to meet new and unique educational needs.

Collaboration. At Rock Creek, we recognize that there are many other agencies involved in providing educational services to the people of the community. A conscious effort is being made to work with these agencies to develop programs in concert where feasible, and to keep communication lines open. The center works closely with the public and private schools of the area. A close liaison is maintained with business and industries to educational programs. The center is fostering the idea of an educational brokerage where people can get information on other educational services offered in the community as well as those at Rock Creek.

If Rock Creek was to meet its commitments, if it was to prove up on its claim of an open-door community center, the programs designed needed to be in mesh with the philosophy. The educational programs have been designed to allow the students to plan programs to meet these individual needs.

Modular Programs

Programs are modularized so that the student can pick the specific learning units needed to meet his learning objective. The student can enter at any time and leave when his goal is achieved. He can reenter the program at any time when additional education is needed. Performance objectives are set forth for each module so that both students and instructors know specifically what is to be learned.

Instruction and production. Many programs give an opportunity

to participate in actual production of products and services. An attempt is made to give the learner as realistic an experience as possible.

Continuous progress. The learner is able to progress in each program at his own learning rate.

Earn and learn. Wherever feasible, programs have been designed where the student can earn as well as learn. This is done when the learner achieves sufficient skill and knowledge so that he can perform close to business and industry standards. At the present time, auto body, diesel, small engine, and welding are programs having the earn-and-learn experience. Eventually, all programs will be geared to providing realistic experiences where students earn as well as learn. Industry and business-based units are in the planning stage.

Variable credit and costs. Student needs to be able to buy a unit of education at a unit cost. There is no valid reason, except tradition, why a student must buy an eleven-week course when he wants and needs only a small unit of the course. Programs at Rock Creek are designed to allow a customer to take and pay for the amount of education he wants.

Educational bank. The traditional college transcript is a record of the grades received in courses. At Rock Creek a system will be devised to record what the student has learned not only on the campus but in activities outside the college as well. Credit for learning is the emphasis. The educational bank account for each student will be kept for him as long as he desires. It will be a record of his learning achievement as he progresses. He will be able to draw on his account whenever necessary to verify his learning accomplishments.

General education. General education opportunities permeate the institution. The facilities, the decor, the staff, the landscape, all build a rich living environment for the student.

Many activities are offered to give students access to the social, political, and economic life of the community. Seminars, films, speeches, and other activities will give the student an awareness of a large society outside his speciality. For example, the

diesel mechanics student will examine the economic, social, and ecological impact of the diesel oil automobile on society. Students will be encouraged to explore the economic, social, and political topics which relate to a career area. In addition, all career areas will have a core of learning experiences which will deal with the social, economic, and political aspects of being a citizen--voting, consumer credit, labor unions, management, taxes, human relations, and others.

Administrative organization. If the Rock Creek concept was to succeed, it needed an administrative organization which would be in keeping with the philosophy of the center. The administrative structure could not be the traditional college approach. We wanted to build an approach which would allow for good communication and at the same time get the job accomplished.

The management team at Rock Creek represents all phases of the operation. Customer services, custodians, curriculum, programs, secretarial, learning resources, community services, and faculty. The group is chaired by the president. The agenda consists of items which any member of the team wants to discuss. If a problem involves other segments of the college, people responsible for these areas are invited to the team meetings to participate in the discussion and resolution of the problem.

This approach to management has its problems, but it has worked well and the people involved believe it is working to support and supplement the total program at Rock Creek.

Support services. To achieve a varied approach to teaching and learning, adequate support is provided in the areas of audivisual materials, curriculum development, tutoring, and other specialized assistance. The curriculum specialist assists instructors in making task analysis, developing learning objectives, and developing individual learning materials.

Learning resource centers are located near the classrooms and laboratories to provide the student with needed materials and equipment. Instructional aides are available to assist the learner in locating needed materials and equipment. These centers maintain a close liaison with the instructor so that learning

difficulties can be diagnosed and treated as close to the learning problem as possible.

Facilities. The facilities for Rock Creek were planned and constructed to carry out the philosophy and program. It is in reality an educational shopping center, planned to meet the various needs of its customers.

Look-in facilities allow people to see what is going on. The malls, the landscaping, the eating-shopping area, the customer services center, and the information center, make services readily available to the student. They physical environment is one which conveys to the student that the place is for him; that he is the center of the operation. The open and visible offices make it easy for a student to find assistance when he needs it. The shops, the customer services area, all are visible and within easy reach of the student. All spaces have been designed to show the student that the college believes in the dignity of each program and respects the student's choice. The eating facilities are planned to allow students a variety of eating experiences. The Branding Iron, the Sweet Shop, The Cafeteria, the formal dining room, give the customer a selection of eating spaces. Facilities are an important part of the learning environment at Rock Creek, and they have been planned and constructed to meet student needs.

What is it all about? Students! Rock Creek is operated with the idea that the center exists for the student and his needs. It recognizes that in our society education is a lifelong process and the educational institution can be an important part of making that concept become a reality. Rock Creek recognizes that change is dramatic and constant and that the center must be geared to being able to meet change both for industry and the community.

Rock Creek must become a vital part of the community and the community must become an integral part of Rock Creek. Like any successful business, Rock Creek needs satisfied customers who look to the center as an educational renewal center for use throughout their life spans.

I know that all this sounds idealistic. More pie in the sky.

However, I hope that each of you will plan to visit our Rock Creek Center and check out what I have said. Come and see for yourself how much of what I have said is being put into practice. We are looking forward to seeing you.

WHAT STILL NEEDS PLUGGING?

A Panel Discussion

Introductory remarks: FREDERICK H. BOYLE, Central Oregon Community College

Dr. De Bernardis has succeeded in giving us a very tangible feeling about the Rock Creek Campus. It is a very exciting concept. De mentioned that there were five or six issues in education that had been bothering him, and it seems to me that Rock Creek is a direct answer to the concerns that De expressed, everyone of them. It recognizes that people are different, recognizes that education ought to make a difference, recognizes that education is a lifelong process, recognizes that all learning has dignity, and optimizes the fact that people should learn to think critically. This morning as we talk about plugging the gaps in higher education, I hope that the members of the panel will relate what they are doing and what they are speaking about to one or more of these factors that De has identified.

RAMON CHACON, Oregon State University, panelist

I agree completely with De's observation that students are different and that they learn in different ways. There is no question in my mind that these differences have to be met, not only in the community colleges, and right now they are doing the best job of meeting these needs, but also in four-year institutions. My particular concerns are in the area of public high school education, which I get very much involved in with my Upward Bound students. I see a significant gap there in that most of the practicing teachers have had very traditional teacher preparation and are not really able to cope with the nontraditional student. That population is increasing, and we have now

had new legislation in favor of the handicapped. In Oregon many of the handicapped students have been put into regular classrooms, and it is interesting to see teachers trying to react to the new problems that they are faced with. Often times they do not know how to deal effectively with culturally different students, and now the handicapped situation is greatly increasing the problem.

But there are a number of things that can be done in teacher preparation programs. Unfortunately, we seem to be locked into a pattern that has been established by accrediting agencies, and obviously these agencies do not represent a population that is different. The changes have to begin at a higher level, filter down to colleges of education, and prepare teachers to understand and deal successfully with the problems of the handicapped and the culturally different.

In contemplating teaching and learning, I agree with Dr. De Bernardis that there is very little teaching that really goes on. Rather, I think that education is learning through people-sharing experiences, through understanding, and through support coming in a variety of ways. This poses the very difficult problem for four-year colleges and universities, with the pressures of large classloads, research, publications, and other kinds of pressures that professors find themselves under. The community colleges are much more capable of meeting individual student needs.

The cycle of poorly prepared teachers in the public schools again calls for radical changes in higher education. For institutions that have been established for decades, it is going to be awfully difficult to make those changes, for we are contending with established tradition and vested interests. But populations are changing, and we are going to have to change with them to survive.

ROBERT ADAMS, Linn-Benton Community College, panelist

Ultimate purpose has to be established in terms that we all understand and can work toward in this country as individuals and as a society. I get extremely concerned that we do not talk enough about ultimate purposes, although action, of course,

must be the result. I believe that education, particularly public education, has an obligation to deal the predetermined objectives which help us move toward some kind of ultimate purpose as individuals and a society. Each of us is born and each of us is going to die, but there will be a period of time here when we work and deal with life together. Individuals obviously are unique, and for me my individual growth and fulfillment is what life is all about. I think we have an obligation to encourage, support, stimulate each other in reaching towards our potential.

Ken Eble talked about togetherness and beginning with individual human dignity. But education does not have any particular dignity per se, unless we ourselves give dignity to the individual human being, to each and all of us. Therefore, I am concerned about the increasing adversary relationships that tend to separate us. I am sure that they are not going to build togetherness. I am concerned that we have twisted the word discrimination into a word that has a bad connotation. Actually, discrimination is not bad. What is bad is the basis on which we discriminate. If we come back to accept the principle that people are different and that each and everyone of us has individual human dignity, all the rest will fall in place.

ORCILIA FORBES, Portland State Univeristy, panelist

The comments of Dr. De Bernardis bring to my mind two important words. They are equality and excellence. I think you can have both in education. If you are striving for those two qualities, there are going to be some gaps. I think we have been working hard to close them, but there are going to be some gaps.

Let me make some assumptions about why the gaps are there. For one, people will require postsecondary education for whatever their vocational and career needs will be in the future. I also think people will desire postsecondary education from a personal enhancement standpoint, and that means people will want to participate in some lifelong process of education. Given all of these things, higher education has a very exciting potential in terms of population. Reflecting on th[illegible] morning's talk, I feel

privileged to be at Portland State University because I think we have that same kind of excitement potential that Dr. De Bernardis already has at Portland Community College.

Some of the gaps are being closed, but for many people there are still three main obstacles between the phase of leaving education at the secondary level and starting that next step of postsecondary education.

One gap that we are creating is access to higher education. The concept of entrance requirements is one potential barrier that is beginning to emerge in our State System and institutions. But we must realize that not everyone leaves high school with a kind of certificate or credential, and once we start thinking that we have to set up entrance barriers, many people who deserve a change are going to get shut out. Hopefully, at Portland State we are not going to be in a position of supporting that situation. We feel at Portland State that we must have different access, a more open access, to be responsible in our community.

There is no question but that financial aid will continue to be a problem that will bar many from postsecondary education. The legislature and foundations have attempted to help in many ways, but we still have a long list of deserving people that are not getting financial assistance; they need to continue their education. Another barrier is that Portland State is in a downtown location. We have tried to make it as accessible as possible to the metropolitan area in terms of subsidizing the bus lines and that sort of thing, but that has not been the answer. We have to be able to be out in the community. Our education has to be acceptable to a very widespread and diverse population and has to be taught in an acceptable manner for many kinds of people. We are going to have to learn from people what they are looking for in the process of education and be ready for it.

The second big gap I see is that we rely almost solely on the traditional ways of accepting the individual into a college, but we do not know yet how to translate some of the other experiences that they had in the interim. People should not be required to come in for that full four years after they have been doing something meaningful in the meantime toward that first

degree. Maybe they should not even have to have that first degree.

What follows after credit for competency is the advising and placement depending upon what the individual wants to do. We still rely on these little mini-tests in math, English, etc. for placement which say the student ought to be able to handle biology, math, chemistry, philosophy, or something else, but do not take into account age, experience, health, handicaps, distance, working 20 or 30 hours a week, the special conditions and circumstances of each individual student. Those are the things that still need much refining.

The third gap is within the learning process itself. We still do not know enough about how to succeed in the education of the high-risk person. We are all groping with the problems of minority persons in the sciences areas and in the health professions. We cannot continue to use the excuse that the high schools are not doing their job and we cannot do it all in the college and therefore the minorities are not going to get there. We do not have a basic knowledge of what is going on in the learning process. The research and maintenance of the quality of instruction and services in the university are not there.

Not enough self-evaluation is going in our own support services, the area I am more familiar with, but it is beginning to happen in the instructional services at Portland State. Our students are participating in a very real way. On the prompting of the student body, we are the first institution in the State System to publish an evaluation of courses. Half of the faculty participated in that evaluation, which was published for students to use in the selection of the courses that they will be taking for next year. It is providing students with a better understanding of what they will get out of a particular course, out of a particular service, out of the whole experience for afterwards.

This brings me to the last gap I see, and that is what happens to the individuals once they leave the institution? What is their performance level in their jobs? What are their contributions to society? What is their reaction to the school afterwards, and how do they involve the rest of the community in the whole educational process? We need to approach the gaps in terms of

these questions. We will start getting some positive answers first by defining our institutional goals, especially in respect to the admission process; second by support for the faculty, the key people in making everything come about; and third by effective work within the community, the people we are supposed to be serving. For institutions like Oregon State and the University of Oregon that serve the whole state and, in fact, the nation, getting answers from their graduates may be very difficult. For Portland State it may be a little easier because we have the compact metropolitan area. That is why I say that PSU is in an exciting kind of situation.

VALERIE McINTYRE, University of Oregon, panelist

Our project on nontraditional and lifelong learning would subscribe to all the concepts which President De Bernardis has identified, but we would have to add one more. That is that all Oregonians should have access to educational opportunities without regard to age, prior education, financial background, distance to a campus, or other circumstances.

Dick Fennel and I are assistant professors at the University of Oregon working on a federal grant. Title 1A of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended. The grant was awarded by the Oregon Education Coordinating Commission, the 1202 Commission in the State of Oregon. Although the University of Oregon became the grantee institution, the proposal was submitted on behalf of a cluster of seven public and private two-year and four-year institutions in Oregon including Clackamas Community College, Eastern Oregon State College, Lane Community College, Marylhurst Education Center, Oregon State University, Portland State University, Southern Oregon State College, and the University of Oregon. The objectives of the Oregon project were to identify the services and programs currently available to nontraditional or lifelong learners, to identify then the needs, and to make recommendations to improve programs for these kinds of learners.

In order to meet these objectives we were involved in a number of activities during the past year. The first was the Oregon inventory of postsecondary educational programs for lifelong

learners, a catalog of programs currently available. This is the first attempt to try to coordinate the various programs throughout Oregon. We made only 250 copies at first printing because we wanted to have an evaluation on content, format, demand, and so forth before we put it into mass production. The evaluation should be done by the end of this month, and we will know then whether or not we should continue with this project.

The inventory is organized around three general information needs from the point of view of the lifelong learner: one, which educational institutions have programs in the field of interest; two, which educational programs are available where the learner lives or works; and three, which programs have elements that are compatible with the learner's time schedule and circumstances, that is, evening or weekend classes, child care, advising services, and so forth. The catalog is organized into six different geographic regions, each region with a chart describing the details of the programs.

Our second major project was the development of a multi-media package. This package includes a 20-minute color film, which attempts to clarify who the nontraditional learners are, programs that are available to them, and some of the obstacles lifelong learners face in trying to gain further education. Along with the film goes a video tape that was made at various discussions of lifelong learning held by civic groups and social agencies throughout Oregon and at a first working conference at the Marylhurst Education Center last July.

Our last activity has been a summer series of three working conferences which involved taxpayers, legislators, educational policy makers, educators and consumers in developing recommendations to improve the nontraditional programs in the state. We published those recommendations in a newsletter. If any participants would like to receive copies of our newsletter, let me know. We have about 300 names on our mailing list; and this year, our second year of funding, the newsletter will try to serve as a clearinghouse for information on the various nontraditional programs throughout the state.

This year's grant has two major components. One is a study to

determine the feasibility of an external degree here in Oregon. The second component is credit for prior learning. Through the CAEL project, Cooperative Assessment of Experiential Learning, we are helping institutions develop their individual program for assessing and granting credit for prior learning.

TIM PERKINS, Oregon State University, panelist

I want to tell about some positive progress that is being made in closing the gaps in the development of writing skills in Oregon. De, as you mentioned, one of the problems you felt in classroom learning and teaching was that frequently it was in a classroom that was totally enclosed. There were obviously no windows, only a door that was frequently closed. Well, I think the same thing holds true for communication channels between departments, even between members of departments on campuses, and it is even worse between institutions in the state. The State of Oregon has taken a few steps to remedy some of these problems, in fact, I think we are trying to remodel the cement walls around our universities and put in some glass so we can see what we are doing.

One of the most positive educational committees which has operated in the state for several years is the State System on Higher Education/Community College Coordinating Committee, which does exactly what the ponderous title implies. It coordinates problems transfers problems, and so on, which might occur between the two-year and the four-year public institutions. Since forty percent of a university's graduates at present did not start at that university, the need for this kind of gap plugging is obvious. Oregon has been able to smooth some transfer problems. More importantly, when you have people sitting around the table who are from different institutions and different segments, they are going to talk before and after the meeting as well. We are opening some communication areas there.

Three years ago, the statewide coordinating committee in turn gave birth to another committee which was called the Ad Hoc Committee on Competencies in English Composition. This ad hoc committee was truly an illuminating experience for everyone on it. We found out all kinds of incredible things that other people were

doing. Among the ten or so institutions originally represented, we discovered ten different philosophies and approaches to the teaching of writing. We found that courses often were not recognizable from one institution to another; even with the same numbers and titles. How in the world is a registrar supposed to be able to transfer credits from another institution when he or she does not know what is happening there?

What the ad hoc committee was able to do initially was regularize grading procedures, transfer problems, credit by examination procedures throughout the state. Now we are not making them all the same and we did not demand that of anyone. All we wanted to know was what everyone was doing in these areas. We made a statewide survey of all two-year and four-year public institutions in the state, and we discovered that many institutions themselves did not know what they were doing. For example, at one college it took me three hours to get an answer on whether or not someone could obtain credit by examination in certain English courses. It was very embarrassing to the people who worked there, but it was also obvious that they did not care. In other words, that is an administrative gap which we found and which I think we have helped fill.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Competencies in English Composition went on to set forth the document called "Thirteen Recommendations," published in June of 1976. These recommendations have served very effectively to help regularize the composition offerings in the state, to identify minimum entry requirements into these courses, and to open communications between high schools, community colleges, and four-year colleges in the state. The State Board of Higher Education has removed our ad hoc status, and we are now called the State Composition Advisory Committee.

What we know about each other's programs as a result of having worked together has been most helpful, and truly I think we have plugged the gap. We have made a difference in the entire state's approach to composition.

But similar problems of understanding and coordination occur on the individual campus. This is a third sort of gap plugging that four-year universities especially might want to note. Many of the four-year schools are starting to do things that community

colleges are founded around. That is to develop learning centers. Every student, the community colleges say, is different, and every student is going to come to us with slightly different abilities. The problem at OSU is, when you have faculty that are already overworked, dealing especially in sciences at this institution, with classes that are far too large for instructors to demand very much writing, and so on, how do you deal with individual problems that students have in communication? OSU now has at least a dozen learning centers on campus. The major two for general subject area development are the Math Sciences Learning Center and the Communication Skills Center, which deals with reading, writing, and study skills problems.

We have found that through these various learning centers we have the ability to do two things. One, we can give every student a chance to work at his own level and to develop as much as he or she wants to develop. Two, we also are a resource for faculty members. We have a great problem here at Oregon State University, in the wide gap between freshmen composition and senior term papers. In other words, students will take the required Writing 121, and they may not write another thing until they are seniors. But writing ability improves only with practice. One of the functions of the Communications Skills Center, then, is to help faculty improve their ability to deal with writing, to suggest alternate ways of dealing with it, to take some of the burden off them--not the responsibility, but some of the workload. Just, for example, yesterday afternoon we had a workshop for 15 OSU faculty dealing with how to evaluate papers in classes. We worked on paper grading sheets, grids to help them save time, suggestions on how to use the learning center more efficiently.

We have also made the Communication Skills Center and most of the learning centers a part of the College and University Teaching Project so that the members of the project are familiar with the facilities and how to use them. We also offer writing proficiency tests in this university which juniors and seniors in various schools are required to take. Five schools on our campus now have this test, including Agriculture, Forestry, Health and Physical Education, Home Economics, and Business. Junior-level students are required to pass these tests or take another writing course in order to graduate. The advantage of this

system is that it does not require any extra work on the part of the faculty. All the mandates, all the instructions, all the testing and so on comes from the individual school on campus. When the School of Agriculture, for example, says that you have to pass this writing proficiency test in order to graduate, students pay attention. We offer them all the options and all the possibilities that they need to prepare and to make up for any deficiencies.

Another liaison problem which we have, and higher education is terribly guilty in this respect, is that there is virtually no communication between schools and colleges as to what the colleges are expecting, what successful college-level work demands. One simple thing that the State Composition Advisory Committee has fostered is active conferences and workshops using college and high school faculty. It is a pleasure and a great benefit for high school English teachers and college English teachers to meet and learn what each other are teaching, what kinds of books and resources we use, and what our mutual and special problems are. We have workshops with faculty at several high school and college campuses and will have others next year. These will involve the faculty from all the disciplines and will stress the importance of students writing in their subject areas, not just in English classes. Finally, we are sending out letters to all the English department faculty in the state to communicate to them what we are thinking of doing here at the University.

Partly through activities of the State Composition Committee, Oregon has now picked up some grants associated with the University of California Bay Area Writing Project which will help solve another gap problem, namely, lifelong learning for teachers. Teachers seem always to feel that they are exempt from this, from the lifelong learning concept. The Bay Area Writing Project, as you may know, is a seed project whereby key faculty from institutions come together, discuss writing, practice writing, discuss writing, practice writing, discuss strategy for teaching writing. Then, they carry this information back to their school. Through this cadre type of concept, you can obviously serve a lot of faculty from relatively small groups. Last summer, the six-week Oregon Writing Project conducted by members of the State Composition Committee for 45 selected secondary teachers, was extremely successful. This coming summer six-week work-

shops will be held for college as well as secondary teachers.

We have always been concerned at OSU with one of the major gaps that Orcilia Forbes stressed, the gap between graduating from high school and entering college, and specifically in the basic skills of writing and math. OSU has developed some suggested basic skills guidelines for students and we are letting high schools know that these are our recommended guidelines. Orcilia warned us that when you set up entry standards you may be setting up entry barriers. I approach this issue from an entirely different direction. I feel that if you set clear standards, you are giving students some idea as to whether or not they are prepared for a class. At OSU we found, for example, that over half of the entering students that scored below 400 on the SAT verbal were not able to pass our English composition the first time. It seems to me that you are doing your students a favor by giving them the opportunity of a prep course and getting them ready for college-level Writing 121 rather than pushing them in to sink or swim. However, we are not forcing anyone to go into remedial course work. We allow students to go on if they want. Our placement procedures, our "entry standards," are designed to help students to know where they stand. If we recommend a placement for them, we are doing it only to help them get started, to succeed rather than fail.

BOYLE

The Composition Committee's concept that writing is the function of everybody that teaches is crucial. I remember when I was teaching English in the seventh grade I could not understand why all people did not understand that. It has been 18 months now since the Composition Committee's report has come out and I would be very interested, Tim, in what reception you feel it has received in the colleges and universities of the state.

PERKINS

Its reception has to be taken from two points of view. First, we had some guaranteed success built into the committee because most of the members were humanities or language arts chairmen

or composition coordinators in their various schools. Regardless of whether we got absolute statewide acceptance of our proposals, at least ten state system and community colleges were doing this anyway.

One of the truly wonderful things that happened on the committee was that most of our recommendations were already implemented before we turned in the report. This result was very simply from the fact that what we were doing made sense to us in our positions and that most of us took it upon ourselves to regularize our procedures. One result is that Writing 121 is now the base composition course in the entire state of Oregon. No longer are there choices between 101, 111, 145, and so forth; the numbering systems are regularized. The committee did that on its own basically.

As far as the official acceptance, the State Board of Higher Education accepted the report enthusiastically, established us as a permanent advisory committee, but did not give us any money.

Several institutions represented in the committee are developing very promising procedures. For instance, the Southern Oregon State College graduation requirement is now a junior-level competency examination in which the student passes an objective examination and writes an essay which must be approved by a subject area professor, an English professor, and a professor at large.

The OSU placement examination is an objective examination, not written papers. Contrary to what you might think, you can measure writing objectively. The Test of Standard Written English, a component of the SAT, correlates very highly with the student's ability to write acceptable essays.

The Composition Committee's workshops with high school and middle school teachers have involved two parts: first, working with the language arts people and showing them ways that they can work with the other faculty members; and second, the entire faculty, in which we try to give them assistance and encouragement and try to plant the seed. Each member of the State Composition Advisory Committee serves as a resource person in helping content-area and vocational education teachers in motivating students in their subject areas. We must overcome the common

misconception that writing is just a simple process of laying pen to paper. Fundamentally, we are also having a thinking crisis.

ADAMS

Let me return to what I meant by purpose. In the community colleges we place the priority on vocational education. In a very definite way, the community colleges have said that work is an end in itself. But, of course, it is not. One of the greatnesses of the community college system is as the individual sees a particular need the community college is open enough that the students can come in and get what they want when they want it. This is how we really begin to fulfill the purpose of what the community college can and should do.

BOYLE

It strikes me that there are more gaps in education than any one of us can possibly think of. There is a great benefit in getting together like this and sharing common concerns about the gaps that we see. I wish more of my academic administrators and more of my faculty were here to share in this discussion.

To bridge the gaps we must recognize what the gaps are and must have the conviction that solving them will make a difference. Basically, the difference is helping the student. I think we are capable of doing that. To solve our problems requires a great deal of cooperation, up and down organizations and across organizations, and requires a great deal of cooperation between the "learners" and the "teachers." I put those words in quotes because sometimes I am not so sure who the learner is and who the teacher is. Over the years, I have learned a great deal from people who were purportedly students.

SITE VISITATIONS

On Friday afternoon, Valerie McIntyre, University of Oregon, presented a video tape on the project which she had described to us at the Friday morning panel, the Oregon Lifelong Learning project funded by HEW through the Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission.

Introductory remarks: VALERIE McINTYRE

The presentation you are about to see is actually in three parts. The film portion of the video tape was created to help facilitate discussions throughout Oregon on how to meet the desires of lifelong learners. During the last year this film was shown to approximately 35 different civic and social groups throughout the state, Chambers of Commerce, Rotary Clubs, and so forth.

Two of those statewide discussion meetings are also on this tape and serve as the introduction to the film. The first discussion was filmed at the Salem Correctional Facility. The second is at a meeting of the Governor's Commission on the Status of Women.. Following the film is a video tape segment filmed at the first working conference at Marylhurst Education Center last spring. All of these presentations are available upon request. If you are interested in them, or more information on the Oregon Lifelong Learning Project, contact: Valerie McIntyre, Oregon Educational Coordinating Commission, 495 State Street, Salem, Oregon 97310 ([503] 378-3921).

Following the Lifelong Learning presentation, groups were conducted on a tour of the following sites of academic support services at Oregon State University: Center for Women's Studies, Jeanne Dost, Director; Communication Skills Center, Tim Perkins, Director; Computer Center, Tom Yates, Director; Educational Opportunity Program, Gwendolyn Henderson, Director; Forestry Media Center, Dale Bever, Assistant Dean of Forestry; Instructional Resources and Materials (IRAM) Center, Ben Purvis, Director; Library Retrieval Systems, Kris Brooks, Operator; Mathematical Sciences Learning Center, Gary Musser, Director; University Exploratory Studies Program, Morris LeMay, Director; University Honors Program, Margaret Meehan, Director.

The annual business meeting of the Academic Affairs Administrators was held on Thursday evening, October 20. The annual business meeting of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education was held on Friday, October 21, following the site visitations. The minutes of the PNCHE 1977 business meeting are attached as part of these Proceedings.

HOW DO WE DO IT? FROM HERE TO THE EIGHTIES

Introductory remarks: STUART E. KNAPP, Oregon State University

I would like to acknowledge the OSU students in Blue Key and Mortar Board for assisting us in this conference. They have served as guides, they have helped us at the registration desk, they have been available all hours during yesterday and today, and we are going to use them as tour guides this afternoon.

Now, I have the privilege of introducing Father William J. Sullivan, the 20th president of Seattle University. He is a graduate of St. Louis University, the Yale Religious Studies Doctoral Program, and the Harvard Business School Institute for Educational Management. I have heard, in fact, that he was the first Roman Catholic priest admitted to the Yale Doctorate Program. In 1975 he came to Seattle University as provost after serving as dean of the St. Louis University School of Divinity for four years. He was appointed president of Seattle University on May 3, 1976.

Since coming to Seattle University he has launched three new educational programs: a joint secondary college program, a human services education program, and a ministerial program. He has been actively involved in the fund raising efforts of Seattle University. In May of this year he was awarded an honorary Doctor of Divinity Degree from the Lutheran Theological Seminary in St. Louis. He is the author of approximately 40 articles on theological education and cultural topics. Father Sullivan will examine with us today our final question, "How Do We Do It? From Here to the Eighties."

FATHER WILLIAM J. SULLIVAN, President, Seattle University

In addressing ourselves to the topic of our role as educational administrators in a time of restraint, and particularly the question of how do we get from here into the Eighties, I want first of all to register a disclaimer. That is to say, obviously, I am not going to propose an answer to that question. That is a kind of either modesty or reluctance which I think all of you would appreciate. To come into a situation like this with a group of experienced administrators and propose an answer to that question would really be foolish.

It reminds me of the story you may have heard of the little community of Roman Catholic sisters who decided to give their convent a little more home atmosphere. They were going to get a pet. They ended up buying a parrot. The only problem was, unknown to them, it was as they would say in the automobile business, a preowned parrot. Somebody else had apparently taught it a few bad habits. The sisters had the parrot for several days and it did not say a word. Finally, one evening it started talking. The problem was that the only thing it would say is, "I'm a whore, I'm a whore." Well, Mother Superior thought that this would not do. She immediately ordered the sisters to take the parrot back. The next morning the sisters started down the street, and going down to the pet shop they bumped into Monsignor Murphy, the pastor from across the street. They are so distressed that Monsignor Murphy asked them what the problem was. They explained about their little parrot and its rather objectionable habit. Monsignor Murphy says, "I'll tell you what we'll do. I have two parrots in the Rectory, and they are both very, very pious. They sit there all day and say, 'Our Father, Our Father; Hail Mary, Hail Mary,' and that's all they do all day long. So bring your little parrot in, and we'll put her in the room there. I'm sure that after a couple of days she'll pick up these very pious habits." The nuns said, "Wonderful, wonderful." They took the little parrot into the room, they put the three parrots in there, and the next day they were all in the room listening. For a long time there is nothing being said. Finally, the little female parrot says, "I'm a whore, I'm a whore," and the one parrot turned to the other and said, "Put your beads away Charlie, our prayers are answered."

I do not want to come in here proposing that kind of an answer to the problems that all of us have, but I do want to share with you some reflections on this problem of administration in a time of restraint and our approach to the 1980's. I want to do this very simply from my perspective as the president of a small independent urban university. Ultimately, this is the only perspective from which I can speak. I am not in a major state-funded institution or a community college. I will simply try to share a few of my reflections with you in the hope that one or another of them may be of some utility to you. If not, perhaps you will have a little better idea, from the independent sector of higher education, of the kinds of difficulties that we are experiencing and some of the things that we are trying to do in view of the 1980's.

The basic context in which I am placing myself is one which I think all of us are familiar with. We have been talking about closing the gaps. What I am trying to do is address what I take to be an extremely critical gap which is going to face American higher education between now and 1984, 1986, 1987, whatever year you want to take.

There are two major elments involved in that gap. One of them is the fact of the declining enrollment of the traditional student, high school student. As John Silver has said, "It is inconceivable that we are going to have the opportunity to educate young people who have not been conceived." Our statistics show us right now that that number is dropping off. The maximum age group in the United States now, in terms of number of persons per year, is now 18 year old. That is the largest single year group in the United States, and behind that the curve drops off rather sharply. You are all familiar, I know, with the studies that the ACE and other groups have done showing that at least in terms of traditional population we are going to face somewhere around a 13 percent to 14 percent decline in the number of graduating seniors in the next eight or nine years.

The second element of that system of constraint is financial. This is one which applies both to the independent and to the state-supported system. The problem of declining enrollments itself presents financial problems: the problem of continuing inflation in our economy; and particularly in the public sector, the

change in political climate with regard to the support of higher education. The general support of higher education has been a tradition in the United States going back to the days of Mr. Jefferson. In some ways that enlightenment dream which Jefferson spoke of, the education of the citizenry and the way in which that has been translated in American society, is changing. There is a sense in which a large segment of American society has lost its confidence in higher education. Therefore, the climate for financial support, particularly in the public sector, has unquestionably changed.

We face the necessity of positioning ourselves at this time for what is going to come in the next eight to ten years. One of the major administrative tasks of the immediate short term, let us say the next two or three years, is the development of a 1984 plan, a 1986, or 1987 plan, or whatever date you want. Each institution must position itself at lease with regard to those two major factors: the change in the traditional enrollment pool and the very substantial change in the type of financial support that we are going to receive at least from the local and state level.

As to how we position ourselves, I would like to propose some possible lines of approach from two different points of view. One is what we might call the constructionist or expansionist point of view, the idea of new or added things that we can do to meet this new situation.

What are some of the things that we as educational administrators are going to have to try to do in these next years in that vein of expansionism or constructionism? One that surfaces immediately in any discussion like this, is better, or bigger, or newer, or more vigorous admissions efforts. An individual institution may take the position that it can do better and secure a larger percentage of that admissions pool than it has done in the past. That may very well be true and that question has to be answered with reference to your own institution, all the while keeping in mind that as part of a whole system you are naturally taking students out of someone else's pool.

There is also, in response to financial stringencies, the efforts toward better, increased, more vigorous fund raising. Until

fairly recently in the history of our country a fund raising for the support of higher education institutions has been a function of the independent sector. We have had to raise anywhere from 25 to 30 percent of our annual operating funds from outside private sources. But now many of our mainline universities in the public sector of American higher education are involved very vigorously in independent fund raising. To my knowledge, the University of Indiana was one of the first to move actively into that kind of work very, very actively. The people at Indiana were smart enough, and this is ten or fifteen years ago, to set up an independent foundation so that the money which they bring in does not become part of the state fund. They have operated very successfully on that kind of system for a number of years.

Another thing that all of us have been doing is to attempt to develop new educational or academic programs. If we believe that we really are responding to the educational needs of society and not dictating those needs, then we have the opportunity within our own resources to develop programs that will respond to new needs that have not yet been addressed. I presume that every institution that is represented here has made some extraordinary efforts in the last years along that line.

Seattle University has been engaged lately in a major effort to develop a new integrated high school and college program. We are now in the fourth year of an integrated six-year curriculum between Seattle Prep, the Jesuit high school in Seattle, and the Arts College at Seattle University. We have students now in the fourth year of that program, and after two more years at Seattle University they will receive a bachelor's degree. That is a program that we hope is going to attract a new clientele of students into the University.

This search for new clientele, of course, is one of the things that most of our institutions are doing, particularly those located in an urban setting. Maybe they are younger, maybe older, maybe more liberally inclined and more practically inclined, but in any case they are all looking for new clientele. We all grew up here under Horace Greeley's instruction to the young people in the East to "Go West, young man." I think what is being said to many of us in urban settings now is, "Go downtown, young man." Services to the business community, the financial

community, the industrial community, clienteles which, generally speaking, the college and university world has neglected, will probably become an important part of our work in these next years.

All of the possibilities I have mentioned are efforts along the constructionist or expansionist mode, that is, our abilities to do new and other things. I would make just two comments on these kinds of efforts. One of them is that I cannot find myself putting all my eggs in that basket. To believe and to operate on the supposition that the problems of enrollment and financial restraint are simply going to be solved in the expansionist mode is simply unrealistic.

The other question would be this, the effect of the new government technique or a jargon called technological assessment. Apparently technological assessment means you try to figure out before hand how much damage your improvement is going to do. I would like to urge on all of us that we do some technological assessment or environmental statements of our own before we get into those kinds of programs. For example, going to a new downtown adult clientele--what will that do to your traditional undergraduate clientele? If you change the image of your institution significantly, does that mean while finding 500 part-time students downtown you lose 500 full-time students on your own campus.

It is like the story of the man who used to walk by the London Zoo early every morning on his way to work. He always went by this one area and every morning there was this great big fierce lion and this beautiful little lamb lying there in the cage together. He was just amazed at this, and day after day he would walk by. Finally, one morning he saw the zoo keeper there and he said, "I've just been watching this and I think that it is fantastic that you have the lion and the lamb lying down in the same cage. How do you do that?" The zoo keeper says, "It's not difficult. We just put a new lamb in every morning."

This is by way of saying that it is extremely important that we assess the impact of some of these moves ahead of time, to see what is the environmental or technological impact the

proposed changes will have on our institutions and on the programs which are now the basis for our institutional identity.

There is a second mode of response to the problems that we face, a kind of contractionist, restraint, limits-of-growth approach. It is a matter of saying, "Small may not be beautiful, but it may be viable." Most of us who are operating today in American higher education, and this is certainly true in the independent sector, must now begin to plan for the reduction in the size of our institutions: that is to say, the number of students and especially the number of faculty and staff. Any institution today, public or private, which is not looking to that end, is being foolhardy. The very heavy probabilities are that in 1987, to take ten years from now, we will have smaller institutions than we have today.

What are some of the ways in which we can survive in those circumstances? Let me just share with you a few which have been part of my life and experience in the last year. One of them is the matter of very careful and rigid internal budget control. That is to say, we must demonstrate to ourselves and to our publics our ability to manage our budgets year after year. This demonstration has a great deal to do with public confidence in terms of fund raising from the private sector, and I can only presume that it has equally as much to do with the confidence that the legislature, its various committees, and so on, would have in the administration of public institutions.

Again, there are internal revenue sources in our own institutional budgets which we perhaps have been neglecting but which in this time of restraint and time of limits we can no longer neglect. Let me just mention a few very simple examples. One of them has to do with the matter of institutional financial aid. The budget which I inherited at Seattle University two years ago had $850,000 of institutional funds for financial aid. That is considerable for an institution of our size. In the last two years, we have been able to reduce that to approximately $490,000, while increasing the total amount of financial aid available to the students by very vigorously pursuing federal funds. We have a $350,000 saving in that one item in the last two years because of our ability to substitute federal financial funds for our own.

When I first became president, Seattle University did not have a really thorough system to deal with college work study. We were perhaps recovering around $70,000 from the government and spending somewhere around $300,000 of our internal funds on noncollege work study student help. Perhaps following a little bit of the philosophy that Dr. De Bernardis referred to this morning, I put out a ukase a couple of weeks after I became president saying, "All student help on this campus is henceforth college work study." We now have an adequate system by which all of the various departments come to a central placement office. The Career Planning and Placement Office is now the source of all of our college work study work. We hire only students who are eligible for federal college work study funds. In one year we increased our recovery from $60,000 to $190,000. We have $250,000 in this year's budget, and I think we will make it.

As you know, institutions are required to put up ten percent internal money from the government, ten percent from yourself. For a number of years, Seattle University had been taking that ten percent NDSL contribution out of current funds. We discovered that we had a relatively large supply of loan funds that had been contributed to the University over the years in the form of a kind of quasi-endowment. Now, if there is one thing that Seattle University does not need at the moment, it is private loan funds. So we have shifted that money over so that our internal private loan funds are functioning as the ten percent to cover the NDSL loans. This transaction is saving us around $50,000 a year out of current funds.

These are simply incidental examples, but I am convinced that in most budgets there are a number of procedures of this type which can make a considerable difference. The items that I just accounted here amount to about $640,000, which is six percent of Seattle University's annual budget. In this time of financial constraint, it is absolutely essential for us to search our budgets carefully for those kinds of savings.

Let me mention another area, the Academic Sunset Law. I am sure that most all of our institutions, whether public or private, have very rigorous procedures that faculty members of department chairmen must go through if they want to get approval of

a new program. The prime irony, of course, is that we do not have any such procedure for existing programs, and that on all our campuses we have a large number of programs which we know could never pass that test if we put them through it.

One of the things that I have mandated to our academic vice president and our academic counsel is the development of a procedure by which we will systematically review the current programs on the same kind of grid that we use for new programs so that we can make a decision that either the program is financially viable; or even if it isn't, is necessary for the mission of the university. If it is neither one of those, it is vital to have this kind of evaluation of existing programs. Of course, you are not only talking about programs; you are talking about courses; you are talking about majors; you are talking about certain degrees.

What I have been talking about are all contractionist of limitation ways of trying to deal with the contracting studentbody and restricted support. Clearly, any one of these procedures has to be adopted to the situation and the metabolism of your own institution. Every university has a kind of life, a rhythm and metabolism of its own. Before you and your institution begin to move into any of these kinds of limiting, contracting sorts of strategies, you must be very sensitive to the particular lifestyle and the particular metabolism of your institution.

But, I say as my conclusion, that it is absolutely essential that every educational institution have now or begin to develop now a plan by which it will meet the almost inevitable contractions of 1984, 1985, and 1986. I am a sailor, and it comes to my mind that in a sense we are trying to sail for a certain mark in the 1984's or 1985's, and I am proposing to myself and to you that we try to hold above the line. When you work your way up wind a little bit and you see you are going to make your mark, then it is easy enough to lie off a little bit and really pick up speed. So some say, "Well, what if it does not happen? What if you've got more students in 1984? What if you've got more money?" That is the easiest thing in the world to correct. Just reach off a little, and that's no problem.

On the other hand, if you find yourself in 1982 and 1983 with

20 percent too much in the way of facilities, then you are going to be in crisis.

That is what I mean by the 1984 plan. It is taking these kinds of enrollment prognostications and financial probabilities and building a plan on them. If the day comes in ten years from now in 1987 when we will be meeting again here at Oregon State, we can all say we were wrong, there are more students, something happened, new clientele, the legislators love us, fine. We can deal with that problem. What I am saying is that we probably cannot deal with the other situation unless we start to prepare for it now.

But colleagues, when we find ourselves talking about these kinds of issues, enrollments, FTEs, per capita's, charge per credit, 1984 plans, etc., etc.--when we say all this, then, I think we have to say one more thing. Let us say to ourselves that we are unprofitable servants. When we get through dealing with all these administrative issues, let's say to ourselves that this is not our mission. Our mission is education, our mission is to assist in the development of young men and women. Our mission is to help them to prepare to live in the 1980's and the 1990's and the 21st Century. It is, I think, one of the occupational hazards of an academic administrator that when he finishes doing his administrative work, he confuses this with his real mission, namely, the mission of education.

As much stress as I want to place on a 1984 plan, I think we need to remind each other the point at which the primary is completed is only the point at which our mission truly begins.

THE THIRTY-NINTH ANNUAL
PACIFIC NORTHWEST CONFERENCE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

(Co-sponsored this year by Academic Affairs Administrators Commission XIV of the American College Personnel Association)

Theme: Closing the Gaps in Higher Education
Host Institution: Oregon State University,
Robert MacVicar, President

PNCHE Conference Steering Committee, 1977-78

Organization

The Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education is composed of participating universities and colleges in Alaska, Alberta, British Columbia, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington. The Conference organization was formed in December, 1949, by the merging of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education with the Northwest Conference on the Arts and Sciences.

Purpose

The purpose of PNCHE is to discuss common problems, share experience and thinking and encourage cooperative activities among faculty, students, and academic administrators of the institutions.

Procedure

PNCHE give primary attention to those practical aspects of higher education which are centered in college classrooms and laboratories. It organizes working discussion groups to consider different phases of a broad theme. It also conducts plenary sessions directed to the theme as a whole. It seeks to prepare participants to convey to their campuses the most helpful and stimulating ideas that originate from the work of the sessions.

It may formulate statements that express the consensus reached by the session or by the majority or minority groups. It schedules major addresses that are topical and informational.

Steering Committee

A Steering Committee plans the meetings and conducts the activities of the Conference between meetings. It includes eleven representatives of participaing institutions and the executive secretary-treasurer. The chairman is the delegate from the institution hosting the next meeting. Elections are held annually. Steering Committee members and officers retain office until their successors are elected and installed. The Steering Committee appoints members to fill vacancies that occur between meetings of the Conference.

Business Session

October 21, 1977

Chairman Ligon called the business session of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education to order at 3:00 p.m. in the Milne Computer Center, Oregon State University.

J. Kenneth Munford, series editor of the Conference, reported that the Proceedings of the 1976 Conference held at Idaho State University had just been published by the Oregon State University Press and that complimentary copies were being distributed to presidents and libraries of all member institutions, to participants in the Conference, and to periodicals and review agencies, in accordance with the MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT between the Conference and the Press. Eight hundred paperback copies were printed at a cost of $1 per copy. Copies remaining after the complimentary distribution will be sold by the Press at $3 per copy. Gross income from sale of Proceedings is divided equally between the Conference and the Press. The status of the account as of July 1, 1977 is as follows:

Statement of Account, OSU Press:

Balance July 1, 1976		$779.63
Gross Sales 7/1/76 - 6/30/77	$793.95	
Less 50%	396.98	396.97
Received from Treasurer of Conference		779.63
Total Credits		$396.97
Binding Minutes	4.40	
Shipping Supplies to Utah	4.87	
Final Shipment to Utah	4.73	14.00
		$382.97

It was moved (Ras Rowe) and seconded (Britta Hansen) to accept the Series Editor's Report. The motion carried.

The Conference adopted the following financial report from the Executive Secretary/Treasure:

Conference Financial Report:

Balance on hand February, 1977		$1,694.27
Receipts: (Fees 23 @ $10, 16 @ $25, 11 @ $50)		1,180.00
		$2,874.27
Expenditures:		
Steering Committee Travel (3 @ $50)	$ 150.00	
Advance for Fall Conference	1,000.00	
Letterhead Printing Costs	40.71	
Discounts on Candian Checks (5 @ .65)	3.25	$1,193.96
On Hand October, 1977		$1,680.31

It was moved (Delmer Goode) and seconded (Britta Hansen) to accept the Executive Secretary/Treasurer's report. The motion

carried. It was directed that the Editor's and Treasurer's reports be included in the 1977 Proceedings. The Proceedings will also include a list of institutions that have paid PNCHE dues and a list of registrants for the Conference.

Because of the lively interest developed by the Thursday afternoon session conducted by Bari Lynn Gilliard on the possibilities of regional consortia for professional instructional development, the Resolutions/Recommendations Committee (Larzette Hale, John Friesen, Ken Munford) moved (John Friesen) that Bari Lynn Gilliard be appointed Chairperson of a committee to study the development of regional instructional development consortia, that Nick Eastman (USU) and Barry Noonan (PCC) be appointed to the committee, and that Bari Lynn Gilliard select other members. The motion was seconded (Ken Munford) and carried. It was then moved (Larzette Hale) and seconded (Britta Hansen) that the Conference adopt as an objective the active support of the Committee on Instructional Development Consortia. The motion carried.

The Nominating Committee (Britta Hansen, Ras Rowe, Barry Noonan) placed in nomination the names of Frank Ligon, Oregon State University, and Barry Noonan, Portland Community College, to fill expired terms on the Steering Committee. It was moved (Britta Hansen) and seconded (Bari Lynn Gilliard) that the nominations be accepted. The motion carried, and both nominees elected to three-year terms.

John Friesen extended an invitation to the Conference to hold the 1978 annual meeting at the University of Calgary, Alberta. The invitation was unanimously accepted by voice vote and John Friesen was unanimously elected Steering Committee Chairman for 1978.

Delmer Goode proposed a resolution thanking co-chairman Stu Knapp (ACAFAD) and Frank Ligon (PNCHE) their efficient and gracious secretaries, Karen Hovendick Sanz, Connie Johnson, and Sabina Wolski, who made all arrangements; the speakers and panelists; and Oregon State University for a hospitable, friendly, and rewarding conference. The resolution was put to a voice vote and unanimously carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Frank Ligon
Steering Committee Chairman

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS

ALASKA

Juneau--University of Alaska, Box 1447, 99801, Dr. Russell Jones, Chancellor

ALBERTA

Alberta--Medicine Hat College
Calgary--Mt. Royal College
College Heights--Canadian Union College
Edmonton--Athabasca University
--University Of Alberta, Dr. Max Wyman, President
Grand Prairie--Grand Prairie Regional College
Lethbridge--Lethbridge Community College
Red Deer--Red Deer College

BRITISH COLUMBIA

Langley--Trinity Western College
Nelson--Notre Dame University
New Westminister--Douglas College
North Vancouver--Capilano College
Vancouver--University of British Columbia
--Vancouver Community College
Victoria--Camuson College

IDAHO

Caldwell--College of Idaho, 83605, Mr. William C. Cassell, President
Nampa--Northwest Nazarene College, 83651, Kenneth H. Pearsall, President

OREGON (cont'd)

Newberg--George Fox College, 97132, Dr. David C. LeShana, President
Portland--Columbia Christian College, 200 NE 91st Avenue, 97220, Dr. J.P. Sanders, President
--Concordia College, 2811 NE Holman, 97211, Erhart P. Weber, President
--Judson Baptist College, 9021 NE Fremont, 97220 Dr. C. Neal Davis, President
--Multonomah School of the Bible, 8435 NE Glisan Street, 97220, Dr. Williard M. Aldrich, President
--Portland Art Museum, SW Park and Madison, 97205 Dr. Ronald Jenkins, Director
--Reed College, 3202 SE Woodstock Blvd., 97202, Mr. Paul E. Bragdon, President
--University of Oregon Dental School, 611 SW Campus Drive, 97201, Dr. Louis G. Terkla, Dean
--University of Portland, 5000 N Willamette Blvd., 97203, Reverend Paul E. Waldschmidt, President
--Warner Pacific College, 2219 SE 68th Avenue, 97215, Dr. E. Joe Gillian, President
--Western Conservation Baptist Theological Seminary, 5511 SE Hawthorne Blvd., 97215, Dr. Earl W. Radmacher, President
Salem--Western Baptist Bible College, 5000 Deer Park Dr., SE, 97302, W. Thomas Younger, President
--Willamette University, 97301, Dr. Robert P. Lisensky, President
St. Benedict--Mt. Angel Seminary, 97373, Rt. Rev. Anselm Galvin, Chancellor

UATH

Ephraim--Snow College, 150 East College Avenue, 84627, Dr. J. Marvin Higbee, President
Ogden--Weber State College, 3750 Harrison Blvd., 84408, Dr. Joseph L. Bishop, President
Price--College of Eastern Utah, 84501, Dr. Dean M. McDonald, President
Provo--Brigham Young University, 84602, Dr. Dallin H. Oaks, President
Salt Lake City--University of Utah, 84112, Dr. David P. Gardner, President

UTAH (cont't)

Salt Lake City--Westminster College, 1840 S 13th E, 84105, President Helmut P. Hofmann

WASHINGTON

Bellingham--Western Washington State College, 516 High Street, 98225, Dr. Paul J. Olscamp, President
Ellensburg--Central Washington State College, 98926 Dr. James E. Brooks, President
Everett--Everett Community College, 801 Wetmore, 98201 Dr. Norman H. Clarke, President
Kirkland--Northwest College of Assemblies of God, PO Box 579, 98033, Dr. D.V. Hurst, President
Longview--Lower Columbia College, 98632, Dr. David B. Story, President
Moses Lake--Big Bend Community College, Andrews and 24th 98837, Dr. Robert J. Wallenstien, President
Olympia--Evergreen State College, 98505, Dan Evans, Pres.
Pullman--Washington State University, 99163, Dr. Glen Terrell, President
Seattle--Seattle Community College, 1718 Broadway, 98122 Mr. Robert Terry, Acting President
--Seattle Pacific College, 3307 3rd Avenue West, 98119, Dr. David L. McKenna, President
--University of Washington, 98195, Dr. John R. Hogness, President
Spokane--Gonzaga University, E 502 Boone Avenue, 99258 Rev. Bernard J. Coughlin, President
--Spokane Community College, W 3410 Ft. George Wright Drive, 99204, Dr. Gerald L. Saling, Pres.
Tacoma--Pacific Lutheran University, 98447, William O. Rieke, President
Walla Walla--Whitman College, 99362, Mr. Robert A. Skotheim, President

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

ALBERTA

John Friesen, Faculty of Education, University of Calgary

IDAHO

Jo Baldridge, University of Idaho, Moscow
Bari Lynn Gilliard, Idaho State University, Pocatello
Ernest Hartung, Idaho Research and Development Foundation, Moscow
Hohn L. McMullen, University of Idaho, Moscow
Ras Rowe, Idaho State University, Pocatello
Francis Seaman, University of Idaho, Moscow

OREGON

O.R. Adams, Linn-Benton Community College, Albany
Edwin L. Anderson, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Reverent George Bernard, CSC, University of Portland
Stefan Bloomfield, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Norman Bonner, Western Evangelical Seminary, Portland
Frederick H. Boyle, Central Oregon Community College, Bend
Ramon Chacon, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Ken Cheney, Linn-Benton Community College, Albany
Marvin Clemmons, Linn-Benton Community College, Albany
Amo DeBernardis, President, Portland Community College, Portland
Vern Dickinson, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Barbara Dixon, Linn-Benton Community College, Albany
Roger Fendall, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Orcilia Forbes, Portland State University, Portland
Joel Galloway, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Delmer M. Goode, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Gary Gray, Oregon Institute of Technology, Klamath Falls
William B. Haburn, Western Baptist College, Salem
Britta Hansen, Lane Community College, Eugene
Kathleen Heath, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Bruce A. Hicks, Western Evangelical Seminary, Milwaukee
John Housley, Linfield College, McMinnville
C. Richard Hoyt, 1105 Buchanan, Corvallis
Herman Hughes, George Fox College, Newberg
Connie Johnson, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Hilda Jones, Oregon State University, Corvallis
David J. King, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Stuart E. Knapp, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Patricia Lantz, Clackamas Community College, Oregon City
Yvonne Lewis, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Frank Ligon, Oregon State University, Corvallis

Jack Liles, Linn-Benton Community College, Albany
James W. Long, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Sally Maluog, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Ellsworth Mayer, Blue Mountain Community College, Pendleton
James McCauley, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Valerie McIntyre, University of Oregon, Eugene
Kenneth Munford, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Barry Noonan, Portland Community College, Portland
Stan Nuffer, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Dean Osterman, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Roger Penn, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Tim Perkins, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Robert Phillips, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Benjamin P. Purvis, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Helmuth Resch, Oregon State University, Corvallis
John Rulifson, Southwestern Oregon Community Colleg, Coos Bay
Karen Hovendick Sanz, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Charles Scott, Clackamas Community College, Oregon City
E.C. Stevenson, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Don Theriault, Oregon Institute of Technology, Klamath Falls
James E. Torpey, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Jean Udall, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Antone C. Van Vliet, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Sabina Wolski, Oregon State University, Corvallis
Carvel Wood, Oregon State University, Corvallis

MONTANA

Margaretha Wessel, Montana State University, Bozeman

UTAH

Kenneth E. Eble, University of Utah, Salt Lake City
Larzette Hale, Utah State University, Logan
Leon McCarrey, Utah State System of Higher Education, Salt Lake City
Dean M. McDonald, President, College of Eastern Utah, Price

WASHINGTON

Nancy Borchgrewink, Seattle Central Community College, Seattle
Dixie Brannon, Washington State University, Pullman
Tom Buell, Portland State University, Portland
James S. Dolliver, Eastern Washington University, Cheney
Robert K. Hamilton, Bellevue Community College, Bellevue
Dave Hitchen, Evergreen State College, Olympia
Will Humphreys, Evergreen State College, Olympia
Henry W. Lennstrom, Lower Columbia College, Longview
Barbara Lentz, Washington State University, Pullman

Bob McFarland, Highline Community College,Midway
Lewis M. McGill, Washington State University, Pullman
Louis McNew, University of Washington, Seattle
JoAnne O'Donnell, University of Washington, Seattle
Anis Quidwai, Fort Wright College, Spokane
George Smith, Olympic Community College, Bremerton
Father William J. Sullivan, S.J., President, Seattle University
Donald M. Warren, Walla Walla College, College Place
Cecilia J. Yound, Bellevue Community College, Bellevue

PROCEEDINGS
of the Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education

J. KENNETH MUNFORD, *Series Editor*

Founded by Dean Edwin B. Stevens (1873-1968) of the University of Washington, the Pacific Northwest Conference on Higher Education held annual meetings 1935-1942 (two in 1937) at the University of Washington. Themes of the conferences included *The Junior College, Implications of Democracy, Personnel Work, General Education,* and *Higher Education Looks at the Future.* In the war years 1943-45 no conferences were held. Since that time the location and theme of the annual conferences have been as follows:

1946 Oregon State College. *The Student as a Factor in His Education.*

1947 University of Washington. *Guidance and Personnel Work in Higher Education.*

1948 University of British Columbia. *Admissions, Curriculum, and Personnel Services.*

1949 Spokane, Washington. Merger with the Northwest Conference on the Arts and Sciences; joint meeting with the Department of Higher Education of the National Education Association.

*1950 Reed College. *Higher Education in a National Emergency.*

1951 No conference.

*1952 Whitman College. *Higher Education and the Advancement of Freedom.*

*1953 University of Oregon. *Higher Education for an Expanding Population.*

*1954 University of Idaho. *Man's Right to Knowledge and the Free Use Thereof.*

*1955 University of Washington. *Quality and Quantity in Higher Education.*

*1956 University of Utah. *Higher Education and the Mature Conscience.*

*1957 College of Puget Sound. *Reclaiming Wastelands in Higher Education.*
*1958 State College of Washington. *Human Values in a Technological Age.*
*1959 Southern Oregon College. *Superior Students.*
*1960 Central Washington College. *Improving Teaching in Colleges and Universities.*
*1961 University of Washington. *Higher Education Re-Examined.*
1962 University of Nevada. *Higher Education, Its Autonomy and Support.*
*1963 Portland State College. *The American College and the Making of an Educated Man.*
*1964 Western Washington State College. *New Knowledge: Its Impact on Higher Education.*
*1965 University of Oregon. *Higher Education for All?*
†1966 University of Idaho. *Responsibilities of Colleges and Universities.*
†1967 Lewis and Clark College. *Toward the 21st Century in Higher Education.*
†1968 University of Utah. *Profess or Perish*
†1969 Oregon State University. *Confrontations.*
†1970 College of Great Falls. *Refocus.*
†1971 Willamette University. *Accountability.*
†1972 University of Lethbridge. *Survival and Challenge.*
1973 The Evergreen State College. *Diversity.*
†1974 Gonzaga University. *Liberal Studies and Career Education.*
†1975 University of Montana. *Quality in Higher Education in Times of Financial Stress.*
†1976 Idaho State University. *The Non-Traditional Student in Higher Education.*
†1977 Oregon State University. *Closing the Gaps in Higher Education*

---

* Proceedings were published but are now out of print. Microfilms or microfilm printouts may be obtained from Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103.

† Proceedings were published and may be obtained at $3 a copy from Oregon State University Press, Corvallis, Oregon 97331.